

# **Heifer Project International**

Building Capacity Through the Cornerstones Model

## **Final Evaluation**

September, 2000

Project No. 938-0158

Cooperative Agreement  
No. FAO-A-00-97-00050-50

This report was prepared for AMA Technologies, Inc. under contract number FAO-C-00-95-00036-00 with the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation, Bureau for Humanitarian Response, USAID.

Team Members: Curtis Schaeffer Jane Yudelman

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	4
HPI Headquarters Report	5
I. Introduction	5
II. Evaluation Methodology	6
III. Headquarters Program Implementation and Support	7
A. Progress Towards Meeting Objectives	7
B. The Cornerstones Model	8
C. Gender	10
D. Impact	11
E. Program Management	12
F. Financial Management	13
G. Sustainability	14
IV. Recommendations	15
Attachment 1: List of People Interviewed	19
Attachment 2: Documents Consulted	20
Bolivia Country Report	21
I. Introduction	21
II Evaluation Methodology	22
III. Findings and Conclusions	23
A. Progress Towards Meeting the Country-specific Objectives of the Matching Grant: A Summary	23
B. Heifer-Bolivia Strategy and Role	24
C. Cornerstones Model	25
D. Gender	25
E. Impact	26
F. Projects and Project Sustainability	27
G. Staffing and Support from Headquarters	30
H. Finance and Administration	31
I. Response to 1996 Final Evaluation Recommendations	31
IV. Recommendations	32
Attachment 1: Evaluation Itinerary	35
Attachment 2: Summary Recommendations from 1996 Final Evaluation of the Heifer-Bolivia Program	36
Attachment 3: Documents Consulted	37

Indonesia Country Report	38
I. Introduction	38
II Evaluation Methodology	39
III Findings and Conclusions	40
A. Progress Towards Meeting the Country-specific Objectives of the Matching Grant: A Summary	41
B. Heifer-Indonesia's Strategy and Strategic Considerations	42
C. Cornerstones Model	46
D. Gender	49
E. Impact	49
F. Projects	50
G. Staffing and Support from Headquarters	53
H. Finances and Administration	53
IV. Recommendations	55
Attachment 1: Evaluation Itinerary	59
Attachment 2: Some Thoughts on Planning, Learning and Support Grants	60
Attachment 3: Documents Consulted	62

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Building Capacity Through the Cornerstone Model” is a matching grant cooperative agreement between Heifer Project International (HPI) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The three year grant was initiated on October 1, 1997. This is one of a series of matching grants between the two organizations, all of which have been designed to strengthen different organizational capacities of HPI. Under the current grant, the implementation and institutionalization of the Cornerstone Model—a values-based planning and management approach and set of tools—was expected to strengthen HPI’s capacity to deliver basic services to partner organizations and communities in order to implement sustainable development in its global programs.

Like the previous matching grants, HPI matched the USAID contribution on a one-to-one dollar basis. Like the previous matching grants, there is significant evidence of organizational improvement and strengthening at HPI headquarters, in the three participating country offices (Bolivia, Zimbabwe, Indonesia) and throughout the respective regions.

This evaluation report does not include the Heifer-Zimbabwe participation in the matching grant due to general insecurity in the country at the time of the scheduled visit by the evaluation team. The report does focus on the programs of Heifer-Bolivia and Heifer-Indonesia, which present two greatly contrasted pictures of country offices and programs. Heifer-Bolivia has more than 40 years experience and a seasoned national staff while Heifer-Indonesia was largely started from “scratch” with new staff-expatriate consultants and nationals. Both country offices developed different strategic plans and have had different results.

HPI headquarters made a major commitment to the grant in terms of matching dollars and staff resources. As in 1996 after the previous matching grant, HPI faces challenges to strengthen the overall mission and clarify the role(s) of the organization although it is now more capable and better equipped to address them. The Cornerstone Model continues to support HPI’s efforts to promote holistic development through the implementation of livestock projects. Gender and impact are more fully institutionalized as key program initiatives, but require further attention and reinforcement. Training continues to be a strength of the organization, however, there remain questions about the transfer of skills and the impact of training. Partnerships and capacity-building are as problematic as ever because of the difficult nature of the work, and HPI can assist country offices to establish criteria and strategies for phasing out of projects. Oversight and accountability at all levels will become more important to the success of the organization as the move toward decentralization accelerates in the coming years.

Finally, the Cornerstone Model has proven its value to the organization. It must continue to be examined and improved upon to take into account the evolving nature of rural development throughout the world. HPI has a proud past and a bright future and the Cornerstone Model should be an important part of that future.

## **HPI HEADQUARTERS REPORT**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

For the last ten years Heifer Project International (HPI) has worked with AID Washington on three matching grants designed to strengthen institutional capacity in key program areas. Each grant has built on the successes of the previous one. In order to better understand the context from which the current grant (the Cornerstones Model Grant) emerged, the main accomplishments of the two earlier grants are described below.

The Evaluation Grant (1990-1992)—This assisted HPI to:

- Develop a one-person monitoring and evaluation office
- Put in place a uniform system of accountability, country program reviews, which paved the way for strategic planning
- Write and publish two widely used manuals—“Looking Back and Looking Forward: A Participatory Approach to Evaluation” and “Livestock for a Small Earth: The Role of Animals in a Just and Sustainable World”

The Training Grant (1994-1996)—This assisted HPI to:

- Institutionalize a participatory self-evaluation methodology
- Take the first steps at measuring impact
- Develop and refine a values-based planning and management approach, the Cornerstones Model, and publish a manual entitled “The Cornerstones Model: Values-based Planning and Management”

In September, 1997, PVC/USAID awarded HPI \$1,275,002 for the Cornerstones Model Grant (1997-2000). HPI committed \$1,612,256, exceeding the required match by approximately \$400,000, thus indicating its commitment to the purpose of the grant.

The purpose of the Cornerstones Model Grant has been to strengthen HPI’s capacity to implement sustainable development in its global program through the delivery of development services, such as technical assistance, gender analysis, monitoring and documentation of project results in three geographic regions—Andean, Southern Africa, and Southeast Asia. To this end, the grant focused specifically on the following key areas:

- Institutionalizing HPI’s Cornerstone Model
- Strengthening HPI’s gender initiatives
- Measuring impact

Although these initiatives were expected to benefit many of HPI’s programs in the three regions, Bolivia, Zimbabwe and Indonesia were identified as focal points for grant activities

Program implementation began in October 1997. A headquarters-based mid-term review was completed in July, 1999. This final evaluation was initiated roughly three months before the expected completion of the grant. HPI has since requested and received a six month no-cost extension.

This evaluation report is divided into three sections. The first addresses the headquarters-level evaluation and the more global issues emerging from the administration of the grant. The second and third sections are in-depth evaluations of the Bolivia and Indonesia programs respectively. An in-depth evaluation of the Zimbabwe program is not included here as the Zimbabwean political situation made it unwise for the evaluation team to visit the country during this evaluation.

## **II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation work began with a desk review of documents provided by HPI to the evaluators, Curt Schaeffer and Jane Yudelman. This was followed by meetings on the 22-23 June at the HPI headquarters in Little Rock. These meetings provided the evaluation team with an opportunity to meet with Jenny Shumaker (the former Director of Evaluation) who was coordinating the matching grant evaluation and review and clarify the scope of work, discuss expectations and determine who needed to be interviewed at headquarters. Discussions also focused on identifying the key areas that needed to be explored in the field portion of the evaluation. This information helped to inform the evaluators when they subsequently developed discussion guides for use in the evaluation.

Field visits were planned for three countries—Bolivia, Indonesia and Zimbabwe—but due to ongoing political unrest, the trip to Zimbabwe was eventually postponed until next year. The Bolivia evaluation was conducted from the 16-26 July and the Indonesia evaluation from 1-15 August. In Bolivia, the core team consisted of Curt Schaeffer, Jennifer Shumaker and Elizabeth Huba-Mang, a locally hired consultant. In Indonesia it consisted of Jane Yudelman, Jennifer Shumaker and Rienzzie Kern (the newly hired Director of Planning and Evaluation). In both cases, local staff joined the evaluation. (See Bolivia and Indonesia Country Reports for further details of team composition and itinerary.)

In both countries the evaluation began with a series of discussions with the HPI country office staff concerning the program's strategy, accomplishments and directions, progress made with regard to the Cornerstones Model, gender and the impact studies, relationships with NGOs and communities, support from headquarters, and finances and administration. Sessions to discuss the expectations of the country staff and the plans for the evaluation were also held. These were followed by field visits during which the evaluation team held group discussions with NGO staff and members of the community organizations, conducted interviews with individual project beneficiaries and visited the animals associated with the project.

At the end of each evaluation, HPI country staff was involved in discussions concerning the conclusions and recommendations and was given an opportunity to seek clarifications and to respond to the recommendations. The individual Country Reports describe the process used in each country in greater detail.

The evaluators again visited HPI headquarters in Little Rock from 26-31 August. During this time they met with and interviewed almost all of the staff<sup>1</sup> who was involved with the matching grant. (See Attachment 1: List of People Interviewed) During this time HPI also arranged for Dr. Felder of Bradley University to present to the staff and evaluators the early findings emanating from the impact study data. Time was also set-aside for the evaluators to present to HPI their findings and draft recommendations from the field evaluations. The evaluators devoted the last day of this visit to developing the recommendations for the headquarters portion of the grant, before returning to their respective locations to write the report.

### **III. HEADQUARTERS PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION AND SUPPORT**

It is important to emphasize that the discussions here are based on only two—Bolivia and Indonesia—of the three target countries. As a result of not being able to visit Zimbabwe, the African approach and achievements—which may or may not change the overall assessment—are not captured here. Where possible reference to Zimbabwe is made, but these references are drawn from documents and discussions with HPI headquarters staff and not from first hand observations and assessments. Tentative plans have been made to visit Zimbabwe in January-February, 2001.

#### **A. Progress Towards Meeting Objectives**

This section discusses the progress made towards meeting the specific program objectives as outlined in the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP). The progress made towards meeting the specific country-level objectives are discussed in each of the Country Reports. In general, HPI has progressed well and met most of the specific objectives that it set for the program. Since the assessment of these is incomplete without the inclusion of Zimbabwe in this evaluation, each specific objective is discussed below in terms of the intent rather than the actual numbers specified.

##### **1. Train:**

- a) HPI staff from 12 countries and staff from 30 partner organizations in how to apply the concepts and tools of the Cornerstones Model; and**
- b) 18 partner organizations how to use gender analysis as a tool for assuring that both women and men farmers are given fair and equitable access to social and economic benefits of development**

The evaluators have confirmed that regional-level training, with attendance of staff from numerous HPI country programs (and in some cases partner organizations and leaders of community organizations) was carried out in the Andean and South East Asia regions on the implementation of the Cornerstones

---

<sup>1</sup> The Gender Coordinator was not present in Little Rock, but instead was interviewed over the phone.



Model and on gender analysis. Additionally, Heifer-Bolivia and Heifer-Indonesia have also conducted a number of training workshops for numerous NGOs and community organizations in both the Cornerstones Model and gender analysis.

**2. Develop 12 impact studies of selected projects to document social and economic benefits and constraints in HPI supported projects:**

During the course of this grant, it was decided that undertaking 12 impact studies was too ambitious an objective. HPI decided, instead, to conduct one impact study in Bolivia, Zimbabwe and Indonesia, with each study covering about four communities. These studies are underway, but are not as far along as originally anticipated. Some data has been entered into the computer, making it possible for HPI's partner in this exercise—Bradley University—to conduct some rudimentary analysis. A report on these findings is anticipated by the end of September

**3. Hire three additional field staff (one in each country) as coordinators of training, monitoring and evaluation of program activities:**

Heifer-Bolivia and Heifer-Indonesia have each hired a coordinator (paid 100% with AID grant funds) to support their efforts in training, and monitoring and evaluation. In Heifer-Bolivia, this person is designated as the Training Coordinator and in Indonesia as the Program Assistant. Both have played important roles in their respective country programs.

**4. Hire consultants in each target country to work on strategies and plans for marketing, micro-enterprises and other specialized areas:**

For this purpose, each of the target countries was provided with a fund for technical services to hire consultants "for marketing, micro-enterprises and other specialized areas." For some reason, both Heifer-Bolivia and Heifer-Indonesia did not take full advantage of this fund, even when in Bolivia's case a need for marketing assistance was articulated by the staff. The no-cost extension does provide each country with a window of opportunity to effectively utilize these funds and each Country Report suggests effective ways to use these funds.

**5. Assist three thousand farm families to improve their economic and social well being through HPI projects:**

Numerous farm families have improved their economic and social well being through HPI projects in the target countries. Over 1200 farm families have benefited in the Bolivia program and some 298 families have benefited in the Indonesia program. It is still difficult to quantify the extent to which these families have improved their economic and social well being through HPI projects. However, it is expected that the final analysis of the impact studies will provide some insight into these areas.

**B. The Cornerstones Model**

HPI has been developing and refining the Cornerstones Model over a number of years, and in October 1996 published the manual entitled "The Cornerstones Model: Value-based Planning and Management." Under this matching grant, HPI proposed to continue

the process of institutionalizing the use of this model through training within HPI itself and in partner organizations.

Perhaps HPI's most notable achievement under this grant has been the extent to which it has been able to institutionalize the Cornerstones Model. Cornerstones Model training both at the regional-level in Asia and Latin America and at the country-level in Bolivia and Indonesia has been extensive over the grant period. Additionally, as part of the institutionalization process, HPI recently facilitated the "Cornerstones Model Dialogue" in which HPI representatives of Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Indonesia, and Zimbabwe came together to discuss their respective perspectives on the use of the Cornerstones Model.

The Cornerstones Model is being used by a number of country offices, including Heifer-Indonesia and Heifer-Bolivia, to develop strategic plans. The Cornerstones Model has also been adopted in the development of the strategic plan for HPI's Asia/South Pacific (A/SP) Region and is being used by a number of departments within HPI headquarters. At the country-level, there is plenty of evidence that the Cornerstones Model has been widely disseminated and is appreciated and used both by NGOs and community organizations as a planning tool that builds on existing resources, promotes values and leads to a concrete strategy. The matching grant, therefore, has clearly contributed to this institutionalization process by supporting regional and country training events and the partial salaries of the Training Director and the former Director of Evaluation, both of whom have played important roles in the process.

Having said that, a number of wider organizational issues have emerged as a result of this institutionalization process. The use of the Cornerstones Model at the community level raises questions about the extent to which HPI can and wants to become involved in broader community development, as opposed to development through livestock-related projects. This unresolved issue is affecting the way in which the Cornerstones Model and the 12 cornerstones<sup>2</sup> are being implemented in various countries. In Indonesia, for example, the Cornerstones Model is being promoted as part of an open-ended community development process, which may or may not lead to Heifer-Indonesia funding. Up until now, there has been no attempt to introduce HPI's cornerstones to project holders and participating community organizations, which means that certain key cornerstones (such as Genuine Need and Justice, Training, Improved Animal Management and Nutrition and Income) are not being adequately addressed in the projects. In Zimbabwe the Cornerstones Model is used in communities after it has been determined that Heifer-Zimbabwe is willing to consider funding a livestock project there and the 12 cornerstones are then used to form the foundation for the projects that emerge. In Bolivia, while the Cornerstones Model is used by communities, the communities are encouraged to develop their own cornerstones. What emerges usually is a set of values devoid of the technical emphasis (such as Improved Animal Management) and intended benefits (Nutrition and Income).

---

<sup>2</sup> Passing on the Gifts, Accountability, Sharing and Caring, Sustainability and Self-reliance, Improved Animal Management, Nutrition and Income, Gender and Family Focus, Genuine Need and Justice, Improving the Environment, Full Participation, Training and Education and Spirituality

From these experiences, it is clear that to further the institutionalization of the Cornerstones Model, HPI headquarters needs to determine certain important parameters. Firstly, in the short term, in order to better inform and guide the country offices, HPI needs to set minimum standards and expectations with respect for the use of the Cornerstones Model and the 12 cornerstones. These then need to be shared with the country offices. Secondly, in the long term, HPI needs to continue its deliberations on how to link its livestock focus to broader community development issues and also make these clear to the country offices.

### **C. Gender**

Gender is one of the 12 HPI cornerstones and was identified through this grant as an area on which the organization chose to place greater emphasis. The issue is not new to HPI as the Women in Livestock Development (WiLD) program was initiated earlier this decade with the hiring of Beth Miller to be the gender specialist at HPI headquarters.

Gender as a program and organizational issue has evolved from a strict focus on women and women's only activities to the family—both men and women taking responsibility for their own development in a collaborative not divisive relationships. The organizational commitment to gender is clear—under this grant, HPI is paying 75% of the Gender Coordinator's salary with the matching grant paying the remaining 25% and after its completion, HPI intends to cover 100% of the cost associated with this position.

The focus on gender in Latin America again predates the matching grant. The grant served to elevate the issue in terms of importance and provide necessary resources to push the gender analysis training ahead. Regional training was conducted in Guatemala in 1997 and in Ecuador in 2000. In the meantime, Bolivia has trained NGO staff and leaders of community organizations while meeting periodically with Heifer staff in Ecuador and Peru. The three Andean countries have developed a coordination strategy to develop plans and indicators on gender and then meet to compare experiences and learn from each other.

In Asia, a regional workshop was in Thailand in 1998. HPI-Indonesia has since conducted 3 in-country gender workshops, training a total of 21 NGOs. NGOs report that staff have been benefited from this training, but they need additional training before they feel totally qualified to bring gender training to the community and a gender focus to projects. Given Heifer-Bolivia's experiences and successes and Heifer-Indonesia's relative newness in this area, Heifer-Indonesia should be encouraged to draw from the experiences of Bolivia as it begins to strengthen its work in this area.

At HPI headquarters, the commitment to gender is clear in its importance to development programs as well as to the workplace. A Gender Policy Task Force was created in 1997 and the organization adopted a gender policy in 1998. A set of goals and a gender action plan have not yet been adopted. In 1999, the Accountability Committee was established to set criteria—including for gender—for affiliates and country offices. HPI headquarters held a gender workshop in March 1999 that included US program and headquarters staff. In June 2000, a three day 'Gender Equity' workshop was held at headquarters for staff.

This was followed by a workshop on ‘Assessing Social Impact’ in July. In addition, during the last year a gender audit was conducted with the support of Interaction and a report is forthcoming. There was also a salary review that looked at gender equity and found that the salaries are fair although low at the lower grades.

Again, the positive cash flow of the organization has facilitated the support for gender by making it possible to fund positions supporting the gender initiative at HPI headquarters and in country offices. There still is not universal acceptance of gender as a justice issue nor full understanding of how gender analysis is applied to programs and how it benefits the work of HPI. This can only be overcome through effective training of staff and by holding all staff accountable for their actions and for the actions of those they supervise. Moreover, in order to apply gender more evenly and consistently throughout the organization, HPI needs to develop a comprehensive strategy that includes indicators for implementation.

#### **D. Impact**

HPI has been grappling with the issue of how to move from anecdotal reports of impact to developing a system that measures and quantifies the impact. As part of this effort, HPI planned under this grant to develop 12 impact studies of selected projects to document social and economic benefits and constraints in HPI supported projects. To better achieve this, HPI entered into a partnership with Bradley University, which was to contribute its technical skills to design the studies and analyze the results. This effort and relationship has been beset with problems including poor communication between Bradley University and the target country offices; data collection and management problems; and difficulties in adhering to the pre-determined dates for products and reports. Perhaps at the root of many of these problems is the fact that Bradley University volunteered its services, without recognizing the extent of coordination and work required to manage the process and produce results. And from HPI’s side, the fact that Bradley University has been volunteering its time and skills meant that it had no real recourse—aside from reclaiming the data—when problems emerged.

It is clear with all of these problems that this is the portion of the matching grant that has not made as much progress as originally intended. Having said that, there has definitely been some forward movement in this area since the mid-term review was conducted in July 1999. One very significant achievement has been the effort that the Bolivia office has put into taking ownership over the process and data, independent of Bradley University. Heifer-Bolivia took the initiative to hire a local consultant who entered and analyzed the data, and shared initial findings with the staff. Based on the interest stimulated through this process, Heifer-Bolivia has developed a plan to continue these efforts to measure impact in some form beyond the grant. Additionally, the interest of both the Ecuador and the Peru country offices have been piqued with this process and they are expressing interest in pursuing something along similar lines. In Indonesia, partly as a result of frustrations encountered in undertaking the impact studies, the country office has instead decided to invest more of its energy in building on the

“Volkswagen”<sup>3</sup>) (also referred to as the “bicycle”) system that was introduced to country offices by the former Director of Evaluation. Indonesia’s efforts in this area might help inform other country offices as well as headquarters, where there has been a general lack of enthusiasm for a simple impact measurement system coupled with lack of consensus on the choice of indicators for measuring impact.

All this aside, data collection is underway in all three countries and data has been entered making it possible to analyze and develop some rudimentary<sup>4</sup> findings and conclusions. Dr. Felder of Bradley University has committed himself to produce a report with these conclusions by the 30<sup>th</sup> September. Whether or not he produces this document by the stipulated date, HPI should terminate its relationship with Bradley University and seek out other expertise to assist in the analysis.

The matching grant has definitely contributed to raising greater institutional awareness about the need to measure impact at HPI. This increased concern for measuring impact has led HPI to expand the number of staff who will be responsible for evaluation. The newly created Organizational Development Department (ODD) will eventually have under its umbrella 5 people (instead of 1) who will deal with evaluation in some way. Additionally, HPI intends to strengthen evaluation capacity within the area programs and most programs area programs are planning to recruit regional staff who will fall under the umbrella of their respective area programs, but will be functionally supported by the headquarters-based evaluation team.

## **E. Program Management**

The Cornerstones Model Matching Grant has been successful because HPI made a commitment to it in terms of staff time, organizational resources and most importantly because it was viewed as an opportunity for organizational strengthening and growth. No one interviewed at HPI headquarters or in Bolivia and Indonesia felt like the matching grant had been imposed upon them, nor that it was an onerous undertaking.

Country-specific objectives for the most part have been achieved or are close to achievement. HPI headquarters has supported the country office in meeting these by providing training support and ongoing assistance on financial matters. Heifer-Bolivia expressed satisfaction with the level of service and management support they have received from HPI headquarters, while Heifer-Indonesia staff made it clear that they could have benefited from more support. Heifer-Indonesia was a new program, being initiated under the auspices of a small consulting firm (working only part-time for HPI) charged with the responsibility of hiring and building the staff, designing and implementing an experimental program and accountable for the financial management of the grant. Given this context, this evaluation also confirms that Heifer-Indonesia could

---

<sup>3</sup> The former Director of Evaluation developed and introduced a three tiered system for measuring impact in HPI. This consisted of a) the “Mercedes”, the academically rigorous studies to be conducted by Bradley University; b) the “Honda”, a continuation of a longitudinal, somewhat less complex study initiated in 1993 in Tanzania, Uganda, India and China; and c) the “Volkswagen” a simple system for country offices to measure project impact.

<sup>4</sup> Rudimentary because data collection is not yet complete.

have clearly benefited from more hands on management and guidance from the Asia/South Pacific Area Director and from the Finance Department.

HPI has been promoting and developing a horizontal management within the regions, a result of which is that at times the line management authority appears to be weak. While there is nothing wrong with a horizontal management structure, it must be clear that in the end someone has to take charge and make decisions and then be accountable for those decisions. Otherwise, roles, responsibilities and expectations are not clear and there is little accountability. In theory, under the current system at HPI, Country Representatives or Directors report to the Area Directors who hold them accountable for all aspects of their operations. In practice though, Country Directors are semi-autonomous with diminished accountability from headquarters. The key leverage point for HPI headquarters is the control of the financial resources, which should be enough to ensure a dynamic relationship with Country Directors. Area Directors have the authority to challenge and push Country Directors who in turn can and should manage up with their bosses. Both should expect a great deal from each other as this is a key relationship for the success of the organizational.

Area directors are supported by a cadre of Program Assistants who provide everything from financial tracking support to report writing to training in the field. The Program Assistants are the unsung heroes of HPI because they play such a vital role in their daily backstopping of country offices. Their efforts are greatly appreciated by Heifer country offices.

## **F. Financial Management**

Managing USAID matching grants is not new for HPI, but it is a fact that HPI has experienced unprecedented growth in the last two years. This has put an undue burden on the Finance and International Program Departments. The two departments have had to work closely together to ensure that the three matching grant countries received daily backstopping, financial tracking and help with reporting.

The Program Assistants have had to assume the bulk of this work with help from Linda Thomas, HPI's internal auditor. According to Ken Harrison, the Chief Financial Officer, there is a plan and funding support to hire an additional finance technician to help with matching grants and ease the plight of the Program Assistants. As long as Program Assistants are expected to do work they were not trained for, they should have the benefit of available training such as the Technoserve training for financial managers on AID regulations and compliance issues.

The most recent financial records are through June 30, 2000 so it is not possible to fully assess the success of Heifer's management of the USAID monies. However, as of June 30, 76% of the USAID grant funds and 85% of the HPI match had been expended with three months left in the grant period.

HPI Program Assistants maintain that Heifer-Bolivia and Heifer-Zimbabwe are on target for spending against budget through the original termination—September 30—date of the

matching grant. Both received an additional \$39,000 in USAID monies that was redistributed from the HPI headquarters budget. This money is expected to be used for project support. As of June 30, Heifer-Indonesia had spent about 55% of the funds allotted to it through this grant. Of the remaining 45%, 60% was intended for projects.

Heifer-Bolivia Director Roger Hinojosa said that his country office is a stronger operation today as a result of having had to design, implement and manage two USAID matching grants. He believes that the managerial skills of his staff are stronger and that they now have greater credibility with donors when they decide to pursue their own funding. Bolivia's accountant/administrator, Carlos Tello, was satisfied with the financial support and guidance he received from the Latin America Program Assistant.

Unlike Bolivia, Heifer-Indonesia started its operations under a USAID grant. The staff expressed concern that they did not receive adequate financial management training at the outset of the grant period, nor ongoing support to establish systems and reporting mechanisms. This resulted in a number of recording and reporting problems, which have since been resolved with the assistance of the Program Assistant for Asia. The Program Assistant also expressed concern that adequate training be given to support countries implementing USAID grants.

### **G. Sustainability**

To fully understand organizational sustainability it is necessary to go back and look at the totality of USAID-HPI matching grants during this past decade. The Evaluation Grant (1990-92) supported the creation of a program accountability process based on the 12 cornerstones that includes project planning, semi-annual monitoring reports and project evaluations. It also paved the way for what is soon to be a fully staffed Planning and Evaluation Unit at HPI with a five people at headquarters and plans to assign another eight technical advisers in the regions. This is a major commitment by HPI that is clearly facilitated by a positive financial position.

The Training Grant (1994-96) provided the funding support and organizational commitment for creating the Cornerstones Model which, through the present matching grant, is becoming the operational basis for organizational development in Little Rock and for the country offices. The Training Grant also established the participatory self-evaluation system that is now a routine activity in most country offices.

The Cornerstones Model Grant (1997-2000) has been instrumental in institutionalizing the Cornerstones Model. While the grant itself serves to highlight the organizational commitment to this initiative, in the end it is the country office staff who work hard understand it, adapt it, implement it and make it a part of their daily work. And this has clearly happened in Bolivia and Indonesia under this grant. This grant has also moved HPI farther along in its commitment to measuring the impact of field programs, in organization-wide acceptance of gender as a fundamental program issue and in further developing a participatory training capacity. As is the case in every organization, there is still not universal understanding and acceptance of some of the initiatives, systems or

tools that have been created over the last ten years. Nevertheless, the organization is stronger and better equipped today than it was ten years ago.

A further indication of the institutionalization of various grant initiatives is the fact that HPI has created a new unit—Organizational Development Department (ODD) encompassing planning and evaluation, training and gender services—for which it will provide 100% funding support once the current matching grant concludes. Many of the services and tools offered by ODD were developed or refined by staff fully or partially supported through matching grants.

At the country office level, most of the projects in Bolivia and Indonesia do not have three full years of implementation and it is much too early to assess sustainability. What was clear to the evaluators in Bolivia, which is further along in its implementation of projects, is that attitudes and practices of project participants—men and women—have changed through the implementation of Cornerstones Model and the projects in which they have participated.

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Bolivia and Indonesia Country Reports list the specific recommendations for each of those programs. What follows here are recommendations that talk to the more global issues of the organization and the management and finances of the grant.

##### Cornerstones Model

1. From this evaluation, it is evident there are varying understandings of, and approaches to implementing, the Cornerstones Model and the 12 cornerstones. HPI needs to determine for itself a minimum set of standards and expectations on the use of the Cornerstones Model and the 12 cornerstones. These standards must be conveyed to the country offices and the Area Directors and should address:
  - strategic options for applying the Cornerstones Model;
  - the extent to which the 12 cornerstones are flexible; and
  - degree of flexibility that exists to incorporate the use of alternative tools in the application of the Cornerstones Model.

##### Gender

2. Gender appears to be viewed as a separate component in HPI programming. Gender analysis, therefore, needs to be integrated more fully into the field programs so that it is seen as an integral part of programming. One step that would help to facilitate this process would be to ensure that the gender dimension is fully incorporated into the implementation of the Cornerstones Model.
3. Much of the programmatic gender agenda is field-driven and could benefit from more direction from headquarters. The Organizational Development Department should therefore provide more direction on gender programming and issues to country offices.



4. There appear to be inconsistencies across countries and at headquarters in the quality and content of gender training. HPI needs to ensure that the training meets a predetermined set of minimum standards. This could be done by developing and using a base training curriculum and a core staff or set of consultants to work with local staff or resource people applying the training.
5. HPI has established a gender policy, the value of which relies on it being effectively implemented. HPI, therefore, needs to develop a set of criteria or indicators in order to monitor its implementation.

#### Impact

6. HPI is moving forward with a variety of different impact-related initiatives (e.g. the Bradley University impact studies, Bolivia's country-specific initiative, plans to collect baseline data in Uganda, the use of the "bicycle" in Indonesia, the creation of a new unit that will include more evaluation staff and so on), without having made some of the more basic decisions. Without the necessary decisions and structure HPI's efforts in evaluation risk continuing to be disparate, rather than promoting a convergence of purpose. HPI needs to develop an evaluation strategy that addresses:
  - defining what impact means to the organization;
  - developing and agreeing upon a simple set of impact measurement indicators;
  - developing a system for coordinating the different impact-related efforts so that there is a true convergence of purpose and approaches that is informative and useful to various needs of HPI.
7. Bradley University has committed itself to providing a report of rudimentary findings and conclusions from the impact studies by 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2000, which was the originally anticipated (prior to the no-cost extension) date on which the matching grant would end. On 1<sup>st</sup> October, HPI should:
  - formally terminate its relationship with Bradley University, retrieving all data
  - identify alternative expertise to assist in the analysis of the data;
  - prior to establishing an alternative working relationship to analyze the data, HPI should clarify for itself, given the breadth of the data, what end results it expects from the analysis; and
  - continue to support ongoing impact measurement initiatives in Bolivia where the country office has taken ownership of the process, and possibly Zimbabwe, pending the results of the field evaluation next year.

#### Training

8. HPI's approach to training in and beyond grant-related activities relies heavily on the transfer of skills through training of trainer, often starting with regional workshops and filtering down to country office staff and NGOs, and then community members. This can be an effective way to spread the benefits of training. However, in order to ensure that it is effective, HPI needs to develop a system to monitor the adequate transfer of skills and subsequent training quality, and impact of training at the community level. Such a system would assess the quality of spin-off training events and identify the extent to which training skills need to be further developed, and would use site visits to assess the application and effectiveness of training at the community level.

9. Long distance training (also known as online training) is now being used as a tool to complement hands-on training, particularly for motivated staff. This is an area that HPI may want to explore as a further means of reinforcing training impact.

#### Partnerships, Capacity-building and New Country Initiatives

10. While in many countries HPI intentionally maintains long-term relationships with project holders, HPI must articulate and apply a set of criteria and strategy for phasing out of projects. This will help HPI be clear about its development objectives (capacity-building and project-related). It will also help HPI to spread and maximize its resources.
11. In HPI country programs, efforts are often directed (in varying levels of intensity) to capacity-building of project holders, be they community organizations or NGOs. As HPI further explores and develops its approach to NGO capacity-building, it needs to define and use indicators and tools for measuring capacity-building. A number of international organizations are using such indicators and tools and HPI could draw upon or adapt these for its own use.
12. The Indonesia country office and program has been established during this grant period, not without a number of programmatic and management concerns. HPI should consider developing a protocol and strategy to facilitate the establishment of new country offices and programs.

#### Program and Financial Management

13. This grant has demonstrated the importance of regular management oversight for new program initiative, such as Indonesia. It is recommended that the A/SP Area Director visit the country office as soon as possible to review the progress of the program and provide guidance consistent with the recommendations made in the Indonesia Country Report. Including a representative from the Organizational Development Department with capacity-building experience could enhance the impact of this visit.
14. HPI is moving towards establishing and using horizontal management systems. These systems fit well with HPI's long-term vision, but at the same time HPI needs to ensure that this horizontal management is not implemented to the exclusion of oversight and accountability.
15. The no-cost extension will be important to furthering the objectives of the matching grant in all three regions. All unspent funds should be programmed on the basis of an HPI headquarters-approved budget for the extension period. In the event that funds cannot be fully expended in Asia, it is recommended that the remaining funds be reallocated to Bolivia and Zimbabwe on the basis of an approved budgeted plan.
16. Diverse program strategies and experiences have emerged under this grant. To further the learning agenda, it is recommended that HPI organize a lessons learned workshop in Africa for staff from the three target countries.
17. Given the lessons learned from this matching grant and HPI's growth, for new initiatives worldwide HPI should consider developing a common financial system based on a minimum set of standards and providing technical support in the use of these.
18. The Program Assistants assume a wide range of responsibilities, which include many of the financial aspects of the programs. Given their level of responsibility, HPI

should provide more opportunities for training in grant management and financial tracking for all Program Assistants.

19. HPI has been going through a growth spurt. This means that programs are increasingly better financed and broadened in scope. Country Representatives should be encouraged to use simple cost-beneficiary analysis to review ongoing and inform new strategies.

## **ATTACHMENT 1: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED**

### **HPI Staff**

Asia/South Pacific Area Director  
Latin America and the Caribbean Area Director  
Africa Area Director  
Director of International Programs  
Director of Organizational Development Department  
Director of Training  
Gender Coordinator  
Former Director of Evaluation  
Deputy Director of Planning and Evaluation  
Chief Financial Officer  
Program Accountant  
Program Assistants

Robert Pelant,  
Jim Hoey,  
Dan Gudahl  
Jim De Vries  
Tim Ogborn  
Jerry Aaker  
Beth Miller  
Jenny Shumaker  
Kathryn Matchett  
Ken Harrison  
Linda Thomas  
Jennifer Knox  
Libby Firth  
Francine Hill  
Denise Leeson-Provost  
Rebecca Alderfer

### **Other**

Bradley University  
Impact Evaluation Consultant

Joe Felder  
Elizabeth Huba-Mang

## **ATTACHMENT 2: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED**

1. Final Evaluation of Heifer Project International's Integrated Farm Family Development Matching Grant IV, Prepared for USAID by Yudelman and Pfohl, August 1996.
2. "Building Capacity Through the Cornerstones Model", Matching Grant Application, Fiscal Year 1997
3. Detailed Implementation Plan, Matching Grant Program "Building Capacity Through the Cornerstones Model", Beginning Date: October 1, 1997.
4. Mid Term Review of Heifer Project International's Building Capacity through the Cornerstones Model-Matching Grant V, Prepared for HPI by Jane Yudelman, July 1999.
5. "The Cornerstones Model: Values-based Planning and Management", Jerry Aaker and Jennifer Shumaker, HPI, 1996
6. The HPI Affiliate Vision, September 1999
7. Heifer Project International 1999 Annual Report
8. HPI Finance Department-Quarterly Report Summaries October 97-June 2000 for CM Matching Grant, Prepared by Linda Thomas, August 2000
9. Heifer Project International Best Gender Practices in Africa Workshop Report, Compiled by Kudzai Akino, February 7-11, Harare.
10. The Harare Declaration on Gender Integration in the HPI Africa Program, The Africa Best Gender Practices Workshop participants, February 11, 2000, Harare.
11. Trip Report Zambia and Zimbabwe, February 1-14, 2000, Beth Miller.
12. Bolivia USAID Matching Grant Cornerstones Workshop Trip Report, April 28-May 3, 2000, by Dan Gudahl, HPI Africa Area Director
13. Gender Equity: From Theory to Programming to Organizational Change Workshop for Heifer Project International, June 5-7, 2000.
14. Assessing Social Impact, July 19, 2000, Dr. Virginia Seitz and Beth Miller, Little Rock.
15. History of HPI-AID Grants, August 2000, Jennifer Shumaker, Little Rock.

# **BOLIVIA COUNTRY REPORT**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Heifer Project International has had a long, productive history in Bolivia since initiating activities in 1957. Within the first 10 years, the organization was working in 6 of 9 departments and was collaborating with 20 different groups/churches. The Methodist Church and the Central Mennonite Committee played key roles in supporting early Heifer-Bolivia's goal of delivering animals to poor farmers who then agreed to 'pass on the gift' to other farmers.

The programs and organizational structures in Bolivia evolved over time from a loose-ad hoc collection of collaborators to an informal alliance of participating organizations/committee and individuals to the present, more established operational structure.

The matching grant initiatives of participatory training, gender, impact and partnership are not new to HPI nor to Heifer-Bolivia. There has always been a strong focus on supporting small farmers through livestock development. Heifer-Bolivia recognized in the 1960's that scarce resources could most effectively be invested by establishing farmers associations instead of working one-on-one with poor farmers. Further, it was decided that greater emphasis had to be placed on training small farmers to manage their animals.

By the early 1980's, Heifer-Bolivia was beginning to look at development more broadly and continued to invest in local ownership of programs by establishing a national board overseeing 54 local committees. At the same time, Heifer-Bolivia broke ground by hiring an outside group to conduct a comprehensive, participatory evaluation interviewing close to 300 program participants with positive findings.

As early as 1987, Heifer-Bolivia recognized the importance of ensuring that women participate more fully in their own development. A project to promote 'women in development' was designed and implemented. Heifer-Bolivia experienced funding difficulties throughout the late 1980's and into the 1990's although it continued to support the development of local NGOs and community based organizations while developing a national staff capacity. In 1992 HPI appointed a Bolivian to be the National Coordinator and Heifer-Bolivia has had an all-Bolivian staff since then.

In 1995 the AID-HPI Training Grant was launched and helped Heifer-Bolivia expand training activities while focusing on fewer projects and coverage areas. In 1997, the Cornerstone Grant was initiated with Bolivia functioning as one of three target countries. Heifer-Bolivia's experience predating the current matching grant demonstrates that issues of planning, partnership, gender, participatory evaluation and impact are not new strategies or commitments. The Cornerstone Matching Grant has provided the resources

and the organizational impetus to build on years of experience in order to actualize values-based planning and management.

## **II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation team consisted of Curt Schaeffer, the external evaluator, Jennifer Shumaker, former Director of Planning and Evaluation, and Elizabeth Huba-Mang, a consultant who has spearheaded the Heifer-Bolivia work on impact. Bolivian staff included Dr. Roger Hinojosa-National Coordinator, Carlos Tello-Administrator/Accountant, Carlos Aramayo-Training Coordinator, Denise Caballero-Gender Issues, Delia Barral-Credit Coordinator and Raul Contreras-Field Worker.

The initial briefing meeting in Bolivia included all Heifer-Bolivia staff and representatives of some of the NGOs they work with. The briefing included a review of the itinerary and a presentation on the historical, cultural context that Heifer-Bolivia works within. Throughout the 10 day evaluation numerous meetings and interviews were conducted with Heifer-Bolivia staff, NGO staff, farmer association leaders and community members. The evaluation group visited the community of Las Gamas and the El Chore. In El Chore, we met with leaders from four different communities from the region. We also visited UNAPEGA offices in Yapacani and Buena Vista. (See Attachment 1: Evaluation Itinerary) Visits to two NGO coverage areas (Altiplano, Beni) were considered not possible due to time limitations and distances. However, in retrospect, a visit to see the Methodist Church project on the Altiplano would have been difficult but could have been done.

A set of questionnaires were developed by the evaluators prior to travel to Bolivia and Indonesia. Questions for NGOs, community organizations and Heifer-Bolivia staff focused on the following areas:

- Cornerstones Model training
- gender analysis
- program impact
- program performance
- partnerships
- staffing and financial management

The AID evaluator and Heifer-Bolivia agreed to the following:

- Heifer-Bolivia will prepare and present a report to the evaluator before his departure that explains what the organization has done with respect to the recommendations from the 1996 Final Evaluation.
- The external evaluation will be conducted that will include field visits and interviews with all Heifer staff and representatives of NGOs and community organizations.
- The final analysis, conclusions and recommendations will be presented and discussed in a participatory manner in order to make it a learning opportunity for Heifer-Bolivia staff and participating organizations.

### **III. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

Heifer-Bolivia has exceeded all of the objectives in the Detailed Implementation Plan. The Bolivia Director and his staff approached the grant as an opportunity to develop organizational capacity while addressing the recommendations from the previous matching grant evaluation.

#### **A. Progress Towards Meeting the Country-specific Objectives of the Matching Grant: A Summary**

**1. Train seven partner organizations in Bolivia in the Cornerstones Model and monitor their use:**

Training in values-based planning and management was conducted twice (Feb., Sept.) in 1998 with the entire Heifer-Bolivia staff, key personnel from four NGOs and leaders from five community organizations; a refresher course was carried out in June 1999 with the same participants; conducted 74 workshops on values-based planning for the members of 5 community umbrella groups representing 31 communities with 545 families participating.

**2. Train HPI staff from the Andean Region in the Cornerstones Model:**

Training in values-based planning and management was facilitated by the HPI Training Director in February 1998 and included key staff from seven Latin American countries along with 4 NGOs and 3 leaders from community organizations; Heifer-Bolivia hosted a dialogue on the application of values-based planning and management in May 2000 that included representatives from Zimbabwe, Indonesia, Ecuador and Peru in addition to leaders from community organizations and NGOs.

**3. Conduct four impact studies:**

The impact studies have been carried out by Heifer-Bolivia in three communities involving 51 families. The same families have participated in data collection over the last three years with there being a summer and winter group for each year. The final data will be collected in December 2000 to complete the commitment of the matching grant.

**4. Social and economic benefit to 800 beneficiary families in projects:**

The combination of projects with community organizations and through the four NGOs reached a total of 1248 families that benefited from receiving livestock and they “passed on the gift”.

**5. Train 50 leaders and extensionists to provide improved services to sustainable development projects:**

74 leaders and promoters from community organizations have been trained in administration and accounting. Over the 3 year period of the grant there have been



numerous meetings with community leaders that have focused on the administration and implementation of projects. A leadership training course was held in 1999 and follow-up course is planned for 25 leaders on political leadership.

## **B. Heifer-Bolivia Strategy and Role**

The Heifer-Bolivia strategy is to use the Cornerstones Model to develop the organizational capacity of NGOs and community organizations in order to improve the quality of living for small-scale farm families. Training in values-based planning and management precedes the commitment of funds for livestock and agriculture projects. While livestock management remains the focus intervention for Heifer-Bolivia, the organization has made a commitment to a more holistic approach to development by including environmental protection, agricultural development and marketing. This is a defined strategy for 5 years with NGOs and community organizations (97-02) and responds to the 1996 Final Evaluation criticism that “HPI is not clear about its role in Bolivia and consequently it is not clear about its program strategy.”

The strategy is to strengthen NGOs that support rural development and to work directly with community organizations and their membership. Heifer-Bolivia has worked with four Bolivian NGOs and five farmer associations throughout the matching grant period. The NGOs (World Concern, Technical University of Beni, the Methodist Church and UNAPEGA-National Livestock Association) work directly with farmers in numerous rural communities in the Departments of Santa Cruz, La Paz and the Beni. Heifer-Bolivia finances institutional strengthening projects with each NGO that is focused on training in values-based planning and management. Funding also includes support for livestock development projects.

In addition, Heifer-Bolivia has made a commitment to providing relief to communities when it is called for. Severe flooding in the Department of Santa Cruz in recent years forced the organization to respond to the immediate relief needs of effected communities. Heifer-Bolivia is now committed to continue this practice when necessary.

A missing piece of the strategy is establishing working relationships with municipalities in coverage areas where there is a local governance presence. Bolivia now has a law of decentralization and popular participation that is designed to help municipalities develop governing capacity and services by channeling funds to them from the national treasury and by opening up the political process through greater grassroots participation. Heifer-Bolivia by its own admission has not taken advantage of these important changes.

Values-based planning and management has resulted in the organization taking on a variety of roles and relationships. Heifer-Bolivia functions as a project donor, a direct implementer of projects, a coordinating institution, a training group and both a formal and informal adviser to individuals, community organizations and NGOs. When an organization offers such a diversity of services, it must be clear about when it is wearing a particular hat and how that affects a relationship. The capacity to play different roles and offer a diversity of services is a strength of the organization. Nevertheless, the roles

can be blurred and need to be clear for Heifer-Bolivia staff, partners and others like municipal leaders in order for the organization to continue to be effective in its various relationships.

### **C. Cornerstones Model**

The Heifer-Bolivia strategy for implementing the Cornerstones Model with community organizations and NGOs is rooted in indigenous values and a family focus. The implementation of the Cornerstones Model does not include the 12 cornerstones. Heifer-Bolivia maintains that the 12 cornerstones are too general and do not translate well into Spanish. Heifer-Bolivia therefore took a different approach based on cultural and historical norms. In this, Heifer-Bolivia, participating NGOs and community organizations developed their own cornerstones through visioning exercises. These are based on Quechua values that are more than five hundred years old and are still widely recognized in the country:

- no seas flojo (work hard)
- no seas mentiroso (be honest)
- no seas ladron (honor)

None of these groups with the exception of Heifer-Bolivia have been exposed to HPI's 12 cornerstones. However, some of HPI's cornerstones do end up being included in the values that are developed by the NGOs and community organizations.

### **D. Gender**

Gender analysis was first introduced to Heifer-Bolivia and to staff from other countries in the region at a HPI headquarters coordinated workshop in Guatemala in 1997. This workshop was instrumental in helping to change staff attitudes and practices because it included country directors who were required to develop action plans for carrying out gender programs in their respective offices. Gender is one of the 12 cornerstones that HPI chose to focus on through the matching grant. The Heifer-Bolivia approach to gender states that "development is the responsibility of the entire family and if the woman is not trained, the process of integrated development is not possible, and sustainability is less possible." On this basis, Heifer-Bolivia uses gender as a common thread for all the training it carries out with NGOs and community organizations. Gender is not regarded as a program add-on that can be discarded once the matching grant terminates, but is a cornerstone that is now an integral part of Heifer-Bolivia programming strategy. This is an important step forward in a country that has denied women equal rights for thousands of years.

The organizational commitment to gender starting in Little Rock and taking hold in Latin America through workshops and training has had a dramatic impact in Bolivia. Heifer-Bolivia has fulfilled all the matching grant objectives on the issue of gender and laid a framework in the Andean Region for further developing the organizational capacity through a close coordination with Heifer offices in Peru and Ecuador.

Women have access to the decision-making levels of the community organizations and attend and participate in all association meetings and are included as officers. Women

sign contracts for livestock with their husbands and participate in livestock management and other technical training that previously was only available to men. In turn, husbands are taking more responsibility for the management of the household and are participating in training that has traditionally been for women. A woman who is now a member of the board of the farmers association in her community told me, “Heifer-Bolivia woke me up”.

Cornerstones Model training emphasizes families and the respective roles of men and women. It does not attempt to change roles and this is an important distinction in helping men and women change attitudes and practices. Most importantly though, the gender initiative has been successful in Bolivia because the Director, Roger Hinojosa, believes in it and has insisted on it being a basis for all training in order to ensure equity and justice in rural communities where Heifer-Bolivia works.

Heifer-Bolivia hired a sociologist to lead this initiative and it is clear that the staff respect each other and work well together regardless of age, profession, gender or experience. Heifer-Bolivia has developed a solid capacity for making gender a program reality, but must continue to fund the position and further develop its experience and know how. Raising the self-confidence and level of participation of women in rural communities have been important achievements, but there must be follow-through and follow-up (particularly with training) in these same communities and families. Training is essential to introducing new ideas and teaching new skills as well as reinforcing what has been learned previously. The roles of men and women and the capacities of families in challenged rural communities will continue to evolve and require support from community organizations, NGOs and Heifer-Bolivia.

## **E. Impact**

Heifer-Bolivia took an aggressive role on this initiative from the beginning. Bradley University agreed to work with the three matching grant focus countries in collecting data for impact studies. While there was a great deal of confusion and resistance to the impact studies among Heifer-Bolivia staff, the Director moved the initiative ahead by hiring a local consultant to help them understand the value of the process.

Heifer-Bolivia was the only country of the three target countries that immediately engaged the Bradley group in redesigning the questionnaire to make it more appropriate for use in rural Bolivian communities. In addition, the consultant helped educate the staff on the impact study process and how it could generate useful information for them, for the participating communities and external sources like HPI Little Rock and donors.

Most importantly, the consultant hired people to collect the data and then managed the process. The data was processed locally and analyzed by the consultant with the Heifer-Bolivia staff. The other target countries sent the data to Bradley and waited for the results. Heifer-Bolivia took a more proactive approach and benefited from the process to a much greater degree by first understanding the value of the information and analysis and then by learning to collect, process and analyze it.

The third year of interviewing in three participating communities was completed while the evaluation team was in Bolivia. The data will now be processed and analyzed and included in a final report from Bradley University. The leader of the Bradley University team, Joe Felder, told the evaluators that Heifer-Bolivia made his job easier and lent credibility to the overall study because the work was done in a thorough, consistent manner.

Most importantly, Heifer-Bolivia has presented a plan to the HPI Latin America Area Director for an ongoing impact evaluation plan for the next five years. This was discussed while the evaluators were in Little Rock and could serve as a model for other regions where HPI works.

Several issues that were discussed with the Heifer-Bolivia staff on the impact studies have to do with collecting baseline data, control groups and measuring indicators. The evaluator made the point that initial cornerstone model training in new communities is an ideal time to collect baseline data. There is a captive audience and exercises like a family inventory of assets lend themselves to baseline data collection.

Impact data is more credible if there is a control group. This possibility was explored in Bolivia, but not acted upon because of the difficulties in matching communities and motivating the control community members to participate. Bradley University encouraged the target countries to set up as demographically varied a group as possible in lieu of a control group.

Finally, it was discussed that indicators need to be developed during the planning process and these must be related to the values and the vision. This is important for staff and project participants so that everyone understands what they have committed to—and to ensure that it is measurable and that there is a mechanism for feeding the information back to the communities and dealing constructively with the impact. The Heifer-Bolivia Strategic Plan for 2000-2001 is further indication of the impact of values-based planning and management.

## **F. Projects and Project Sustainability**

### **1) Overview**

Values-based planning and management can only be successful with a strong training base. Heifer-Bolivia has invested a great deal of staff time and matching grant resources in the creation of a dynamic training capacity that is regularly evolving—learning from past errors while adapting to new realities in rural Bolivian communities. Heifer-Bolivia is very clear in its strategy that support for livestock development will remain a constant in all of its program activities. The process of developing a training capacity through work with rural communities has created a methodology that is focused on communities taking responsibility for their own development.

The Detailed Implementation Plan states that “all HPI supported projects use livestock and training as the tools to stimulate group and community development.” Further, “the objectives of each project vary according to need, but in general it can be said that all

projects aim to improve the standard of living for small-scale farm families.” Heifer-Bolivia has made good on this commitment by ensuring the equitable participation of men and women and by promoting a more diversified approach to rural development by including agriculture and the natural environment.

## 2) NGOs

Heifer-Bolivia works with four NGOs. Its work with these four NGOs is reflective of how different each organization is and how challenging it is to strengthen the capacity of other organizations. The Cornerstones Model is a valuable set of tools for institutional strengthening but each organization has to be approached differently and requires particular attention. The four NGOs are referred to in Spanish as ‘portadores’, which translates as the ‘carrier or bearer’.

The best established of the NGOs is World Concern, which has a strong training base and is philosophically in tune with the HPI approach to working with farmers associations. World Concern has worked effectively during the grant period with a woman’s community organization in Las Gamas by using values-based planning and management to organize and develop the group. The women in the group explained that they were not accustomed to taking responsibility for productive activities, other than livestock, and had never thought in terms of ‘family welfare’. The women’s group is starting a small scale dairy on land that was purchased years ago. The success of the dairy will go a long way towards determining the future of the community organization and may well determine the future of the community itself. A successful dairy will mean more income and new members for the community organization. If the dairy does not succeed, families may be motivated to move to the nearby departmental capital of Santa Cruz. The unique characteristics of Las Gamas (little land, men leave to work elsewhere, access to city) are similar in 3-4 other communities in the area that World Concern and Heifer-Bolivia could assess for potential future projects.

UNAPEGA was created by Heifer-Bolivia in the early 1980’s and has developed a solid base of operation in the Department of Santa Cruz. The NGO has survived, but it is still struggling to be fully self-sustaining. In addition to Heifer-Bolivia’s training and modest financial support to UNAPEGA, the NGO has successfully attracted support from European donors for a municipal slaughterhouse that will benefit small farmers. It also has funding support from CARE to support honey producers and is involved in an eco-tourism project. Heifer-Bolivia has provided consistent, effective support to UNAPEGA over the years. At the same time UNAPEGA is stretched very thin in terms of staff, resources and commitments. Additional Cornerstones Model training needs to be carried out with the UNAPEGA staff as it is not clear to what extent they understand and practice values-based planning and management.

I was not able to visit any of the communities where UNAPEGA works with farmers associations, we did talk with their staff at length. UNAPEGA now functions as a community organization, as a NGO and as a consultant. Multiple roles again can be both a strength and a weakness, but UNAPEGA best determines its future by using values-

based planning and management. UNAPEGA would also benefit from help on identifying new donors and fundraising.

World Concern and UNAPEGA could both benefit from technical assistance for help with marketing agricultural products, which is a chronic problem in rural Bolivia. Again, Heifer-Bolivia has the resources and can work with these NGOs to strengthen their marketing capacity. The challenge is to find appropriate help locally.

The Methodist Church and the Technical University of Beni present different problems. Both operate in other departments and are not readily accessible to Heifer-Bolivia staff. For example, two trips a year are made to the Trinidad area where the Technical University works. While Heifer-Bolivia has had a close working relationship with the Methodist Church since the 1950's, there are difficulties in coordinating with an organization that is experiencing financial problems and is not accessible. It is not clear what Heifer-Bolivia expects from these relationships, nor how sustainable institution building is from afar. At the same time, both relationships represent risk-taking and present different challenges for Heifer-Bolivia staff.

Institutional strengthening requires a close, dynamic relationship between the organization and the NGO. This is geographically not possible with the Technical University and the Methodist Church. Heifer-Bolivia should continue to follow its strategies in working with these organizations through the committed period of 2002 and learn from the experiences to shape future institutional building programs. One NGO representative told me that he values the training and of course the financial support, but he most appreciates the informal support from Heifer—Bolivia—the strategizing, problem solving and advice.

## 2) Farmers Associations

The five farmers associations have benefited from working with Heifer-Bolivia. These associations (San Julian, El Chore, Yucumo, Berlin & Alto Beni) function as umbrella groups for particular geographic areas—each one includes a number of different communities. Training the leadership (made up of leaders from the different communities) of the umbrella association serves to tap into the interest and potential in each community. The structure also allows the umbrella association to take direct responsibility for training and project administration in a phased approach.

The implementation of the Cornerstones Model with the farmers associations has helped Heifer-Bolivia evolve into an organization that promotes a broader approach to rural development while continuing to focus on livestock management as a mainstay. Again, this is a natural progression for any organization or country office that understands and embraces values-based planning and management as designed by HPI.

Heifer-Bolivia has developed credibility for its presence and continuing support of rural communities in the Department of Santa Cruz over the last 40 years. I was told by several small farmers that most organizations come and make promises and then move on after several years—Heifer-Bolivia has always been there. The organization has long term

relationships with some communities in the Department of Santa Cruz that go back as far as 20 years or more. In some cases, support for these communities is now channeled through NGOs and not provided directly. Nevertheless, these relationships do raise a question of how long Heifer-Bolivia should continue to invest resources in a community (or through an NGO) and the cost-effectiveness of providing long term support.

Numerous trainings in values-based planning and management have been carried out by Heifer-Bolivia staff with NGOs and community organizations. While the training has had an impact on these organizations, the issue of measuring the impact of institutional strengthening is still unresolved. Heifer-Bolivia could benefit from HPI assistance on this issue.

### **G. Staffing and Support from Headquarters**

Heifer-Bolivia benefits from a staff that combines a variety of ages, gender and experience. The present group could benefit from the addition of a production/marketing specialist. This could be done immediately for the short run by using the technical services funds allocated under the matching grant. Staff have taken advantage of HPI training in the region during the matching grant period and should continue to look for opportunities external to the organization.

The AID funds pay for the Training Coordinator and 20% of the salaries of the following positions:

- Dr. Roger Hinojosa-National Director (veterinarian)
- Carlos Tello- Administrator/Accountant
- Carlos Aramayo-Trainer (agronomist)
- Delia Barral-Field Worker (food technician)
- Raul Contreras-Field Worker (ag. technician)
- Denyse Caballero-Gender Coordinator (sociologist)
- Fabiola Ortiz-Secretary

Heifer-Bolivia has benefited from the regular management support of the Latin America/Caribbean Region Area Director Jim Hoey. Mr. Hoey was supportive of Bolivia's participation in this and the previous matching grant. In addition, he has promoted regional coordination of values-based planning and management and the idea that HPI country offices have a great deal to learn from each other's experiences.

The HPI Gender Coordinator, Beth Miller, planned and facilitated the 1997 Gender workshop in Guatemala that included key staff from all of the HPI countries in Latin America. This workshop served to introduce values-based planning and management to countries throughout Latin America.

Mr. Jerry Aaker, Director of Training and the Matching Grant Manager, helped facilitate the Cornerstone Model Dialogue that included representatives of Bolivia, Indonesia and Zimbabwe along with Ecuador and Peru in May 2000. Other headquarters support has been provided on a consistent basis by the Finance Department and the Program

Assistant for Latin America. Clearly, HPI headquarters has taken this commitment seriously and provided support throughout the grant period.

## **H. Finance and Administration**

Financial management and reporting on matching grant funds is another successful activity of Heifer-Bolivia. Spending on grant funds (both AID, HPI) is on track for the original termination date of September 30 with the exception of the technical or contracted services line item. As of the end of June 2000, Heifer-Bolivia had exceeded the HPI and was under-spent in the AID portion of the budget by \$90,000 according to the HPI Finance Department in Little Rock. There is not enough detail in the financial reports provided by HPI Finance Department to determine how the line items break down, but apparently spending on project grants has exceeded budget.

Heifer-Bolivia prepares and sends matching grant financial reports to Little Rock every 6 months. The HPI staff in Little Rock lauded Heifer-Bolivia for its timely, accurate and thorough reporting.

Heifer-Bolivia is included in the annual A-133 audit of the matching grant conducted in Little Rock. In addition, the country office submits to a local audit annually. The financial manager for Heifer-Bolivia is experienced and is well versed in AID regulations. He also participates in field training of farmers associations and has developed a simple curriculum on how community organizations and households can do their own budgeting.

The matching grant provided Heifer-Bolivia with the financial backing (both AID and HPI monies) to fully respond to the recommendations of the 1996 final evaluation. The strong economic position of HPI has also contributed to an improved operating climate and will allow Heifer-Bolivia to continue the activities of the matching grant for the next two years.

Heifer-Bolivia does no independent fundraising and has not had to during the course of the matching grant. The organization does have a solid track record and great potential for raising funds in Bolivia. This is an important consideration for the future.

## **I. Response to 1996 Final Evaluation Recommendations**

The 1996 Final Evaluation of the Training Matching Grant offered a number of recommendations for how Heifer-Bolivia could improve its program strategies and training capacity. (See Attachment 2: Summary Recommendations) Indeed the Cornerstones Model Matching Grant is based upon the recommendations from 1996 and most of these have been acted upon. The result is that Heifer-Bolivia is a stronger organization today than it was in 1996.

The implementation of values-based planning and management forced Heifer-Bolivia to strengthen its own capacity as an organization before engaging other organizations-it has learned to practice what it preaches. With respect to program strategy, Heifer-Bolivia has engaged in annual strategic planning that has served to better define the role(s) of the



organization. It has also served to put more rigor into the project development process with NGOs and community organizations.

One of the Heifer-Bolivia achievements with the help of the matching grant is the development of a viable training capacity. This has been done by bolstering the staff (added a training director and gender specialist positions) and involving the entire staff in planning and implementing training. The result is that a dynamic internal process has been created that ties all staff to the core business of the organization. The training capacity of Heifer-Bolivia includes the development of numerous tools, exercises and guides that are regularly improved upon with each new training experience. Training is participatory, it includes men and women, it is cost-effective and it respects local customs and know how.

Heifer-Bolivia combined its strong base of experience with matching grant funds and the Cornerstone Model training and methodologies to transform its operation. While Heifer-Bolivia has made tremendous strides forward and responded positively to the majority of the 1996 recommendations, three years is a short period of time in which to transform an organization. By its own admission, Heifer-Bolivia has initiated or put in motion a number of initiatives that will require more time to develop. These include:

- learning network with the participating NGOs that will develop a closer working relationship while reinforcing values-based planning and management skills
- regional coordination with HPI Ecuador and Peru to further strengthen the gender and impact initiatives
- further develop a useful system of evaluation with measurable indicators
- increase staff size and expand the office

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

Heifer-Bolivia has worked hard since the 1996 evaluation to address its shortcomings by responding to the recommendations of the 'Final Evaluation'. Two recommendations were not adequately addressed by Heifer-Bolivia during the current matching grant period and are repeated in this report. (See Recommendation #1 and #2)

##### Strategy

1. *Criteria for working with NGOs:* Heifer-Bolivia's work with grassroots organizations is strong, whereas its work with NGOs is weak. If Heifer-Bolivia is serious about maximizing its impact by working with NGOs, it must develop a clear strategy for doing this. Consideration should be given to the accessibility of the NGO to Heifer-Bolivia staff. If it is decided to work with NGOs in other areas of the country, then a staff person must be committed to living and working in that same area.
2. *Exit strategy for NGOs:* Heifer-Bolivia has not clearly articulated and applied the criteria for determining when a project should be phased out. While Heifer-Bolivia intentionally maintains long-term relationships with its project holders, it must

develop a set of criteria and strategy for phase-out of a project. Among other things, this will help Heifer-Bolivia to be clear about its organizational (grassroots and NGO) development objectives. It will also help Heifer-Bolivia spread and maximize its limited resources.

3. *Consolidate/strengthen Heifer-Bolivia capacity:* Given its strong performance during this grant period with community based organizations and mixed performance with NGOs, Heifer-Bolivia should continue to strengthen its capacity in utilizing the Cornerstones Model to build the capacity of partners. Funding support to existing matching grant projects has been committed by HPI headquarters through 2002, which allows Heifer-Bolivia to concentrate on the following:
  - coordination with HP Ecuador and Peru in furthering the learning network created during this matching grant
  - develop internal capacity to design new projects and secure funding (this includes headquarters support for developing a fundraising capacity in Bolivia)
  - new project activity should be limited to existing coverage areas for the next two years
4. *Develop relationships with municipal governments:* HPI should follow its own strategy of developing relationships with municipal governments in coverage areas. In turn, NGOs and community organizations should be encouraged to develop their own relationships with municipalities through training, participation in elections and attendance at meetings

#### Projects

5. *Animal credit adjustments:* Heifer-Bolivia requires that the loan of an animal to a family be preceded by a contract signed by both the husband and wife along with the board members of the farmers association. This is called an animal credit program but Heifer-Bolivia does not keep records on the status of the animals over time other than passing on the gift to another farmer or the death of an animal. If the animal is not passed on, for whatever reason, there is no accounting for delinquencies.
  - Heifer-Bolivia should be clear about the repayment rate on all loans of animals or materials as a part of its internal accountability and as a measurement of impact for farmers associations.
  - There is also no accounting for the ultimate status of an animal. It is recommended that the gift ultimately become the property of the farmer's association as a means of fortifying its assets.
6. *Technical assistance:* Heifer-Bolivia has a balance of approximately \$30,000 for technical services and should use these funds to hire a marketing specialist through the end of the no cost extension period. Heifer-Bolivia, NGOs and community based organizations all expressed the need for help in marketing. Bolivia is a special case due to small markets, cheap-illegal imports and local competition. Other potential uses of these funds:
  - recruit and short term hire of technical consultants who could potentially work as full-time employees
  - new impact studies/continuation of existing data collection in 3 communities

- establish a web page for Latin American countries in Bolivia that includes numerous documents, training materials, impact studies analysis etc.
7. *Involve youth in projects:* Rural communities where Heifer-Bolivia and NGO partners work have a lack of land and opportunities for future generations. The youth in these communities often live in larger cities to study and ultimately to work. The future of these communities are tenuous. It is recommended that Heifer-Bolivia explore options for involving the youth of the communities in the community organization and the projects.

#### Impact

8. *Share impact data/analysis with NGOs and community organizations:* Heifer-Bolivia has successfully collected and analyzed impact data but has not yet shared the information with participating communities. Now that the matching grant period is concluding and the data has been collected and analyzed, it is necessary to share the information by developing a plan and timetable to do this.

#### Administration

9. *More documentation:* Documentation of project activities is well done and complete. Heifer-Bolivia should write-up two other documents for dissemination to other countries. The first is a lessons learned paper from three years of experience implementing the values-based planning and management approach. The second is a short paper on grant management from a country office perspective that could be useful to other country offices and to HPI headquarters Program Assistants.

## **ATTACHMENT 1: EVALUATION ITINERARY**

July 16	Arrival in Santa Cruz-meet staff over dinner
July 17-	Initial briefing session with entire Heifer Bolivia staff and representatives from World Concern and UNAPEGA; review of documents
July 18	Visit to rural community where World Concern implements values based planning and management with Heifer Bolivia funding and training support-Las Gamas
July 19	Review and analysis of Las Gamas visit; leave for El Chore in the PM; Overnight in Santa Rosa del Sarah
July 20	Visit to community organization-Region El Chore-Community Cuatro de Marzo (included representatives and community members from 4 communities in the region)
July 21	Visit to offices and different programs en Yapacani of Union Nacional de Productores Agropecuarios Integrales (UNAPEGA)
July 22-	Return to Santa Cruz-review of visits and preparation of conclusions/recommendations
July 24-25	Analysis and review of Cornerstone Model matching grant program with Heifer-Bolivia staff and representatives from NGOs, community organizations and Heifer Headquarters, Ecuador and Peru
July 26	Return to United States

## **ATTACHMENT 2: SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 1996 FINAL EVALUATION OF HEIFER-BOLIVIA PROGRAM**

1. Field programs face major challenges (small business development, sustainable ag, environment) and issues of institutional strengthening. Recommend: Hire more staff with expertise in these areas.
2. Need strategic vision and plans to proactively address newly emerging needs, either directly or through links with other organizations.
3. Work with grassroots organizations is strong, but weak with NGOs. Recommend: To maximize impact by working with NGOs, must develop a clear strategy for institutional strengthening of partners.
4. No clear criteria for project phase out. Recommend: HPI should develop a set of criteria and strategy for phase-out. This will help spread and maximize limited resources.
5. The current training model/resource book is too culture and site specific to have maximum impact on global programs. Recommend: Put greater emphasis on peer sharing of participatory training materials and approaches through regional or worldwide field-based workshops.
6. No measurement of impact of this grant. Recommend: In short term, conduct several case studies in Uganda and Bolivia. In long term, develop a monitoring and evaluation system for measuring the impact of projects on nutrition and income.
7. Some movement in gender in programs, but needs to be emphasized more. Recommend: A long term strategy that emphasizes the inclusion of gender issues in the early stages of project development and strong follow-up.

### **ATTACHMENT 3: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED**

- 1) Informe Anual-Cornerstone Grant Oct. 1-Sept. 30, 1998
- 2) Strategic Plan: Bolivia-July 1999
- 3) Segundo Informe Anual-Cornerstone Grant, August 1999
- 4) Building Capacity Through the Cornerstone Model-Matching Grant Report for USAID, Second Annual Report, October 1 through September 30, 1999
- 5) Memoria del Taller: Seguimiento a La Planificación Basada en Valores De La Asociación Local de 4 de Marzo, 16 de Mayo, 2000, El Chore, Santa Cruz
- 6) International Encounter on the Application of the Cornerstones Model in Zimbabwe, Indonesia and Bolivia, May 28-June 2, 2000, Santa Cruz
- 7) Memoria de la Reunion-Dialogo Sobre La Aplicación del Modelo de Los Fundamentos en Bolivia, Indonesia y Zimbabwe, 28 de Mayo al 2 de Junio, 2000, Santa Cruz
- 8) Bolivia USAID Matching Grant Cornerstones Workshop Trip Report, April 28-May 3, 2000, by Dan Gudahl, HPI Africa Area Director
- 9) The Cornerstone Model Dialogue Draft Summary, May 28-June 2, 2000, by Jerry Aaker, Santa Cruz.
- 10) The History of HPI in Bolivia, June 21, 2000
- 11) Focus on Gender in HPI-Bolivia Projects, June 27, 2000, Santa Cruz
- 12) Tercer Informe Annual-Cornerstone Grant, 1 de octubre de 1999 al 30 de septiembre de 2000
- 13) Evaluación en Base Al Plan De Accion Del Plan Estratégico
- 14) Plan Detallado de la Implementacion del Cornerstone Grant Octubre de 1997-Septiembre de 2000
- 15) Informe Evaluativo Sobre El Cornerstone Grant en Bolivia (Septiembre de 1997-Julio del 2000)
- 16) Esquema de Planificación Estrategica 2000-2001
- 17) Contrato de Credito en Animales (ejemplar)
- 18) Presupuesto Training Grant Septiembre 1997-Agosto 2000
- 19) Análisis Global Del Presupuesto Aprobado Para Bolivia, Octubre 1997-2000
- 20) Informe Economico Global, Octubre 1997-2000
- 21) Informe Del Numero De Bovinos Comprados Que Han Sido Entregados en Berlin, Yucumo, San Julian, El Chore
- 22) Executive Summary: Cornerstones and Impacts-Reviewing some of the Cornerstones with priority for the partners of Heifer Bolivia, Elisabeth-Maria Huba-Mang, August 2000

# INDONESIA COUNTRY REPORT

## I. INTRODUCTION

HPI has supported livestock projects with NGOs in Indonesia since the early 1980s. Up until 1996, project oversight was conducted from HPI headquarters in Little Rock. In 1996, HPI began the process of consolidating its work in Indonesia into a unified country program with a field office and representatives for Heifer-Indonesia. To facilitate this process, HPI contracted on a part-time basis the services of Kate Gieger, the former director of HPI's Philippines program and one of the founders of Jasa KATOM, an Indonesian consulting organization. The first year was devoted to defining the Heifer-Indonesia program—its geographical scope and identifying potential local NGOs as “partner” organizations—and to exploring funding potential and resources. In 1997, HPI submitted a matching grant proposal (entitled “Building Capacity through the Cornerstones Model”) to USAID that included Indonesia as one of the three focal countries. With USAID's approval of this grant and its implementation, starting in October 1997, Heifer-Indonesia was provided with the additional resources needed to expand the staff and promote the program. This matching grant has, therefore, made it possible for a brand new country office and program to be initiated.

Currently, Heifer-Indonesia is staffed through a sub-contractual arrangement<sup>5</sup> with Jasa KATOM and the office is along the home of the Jasa KATOM consultants in Bukittinggi, Sumatra. This arrangement provided Heifer-Indonesia with an easy entry into the country and makes it one of the few HPI country programs to be run by expatriate staff. There has, however, been some discussion about attempting to register Heifer-Indonesia with the Government of Indonesia as local organization in the future. The Heifer-Indonesia program is headed by two Co-Country Representatives—Kate Gieger at 50% of her time and Tom Dierolf, co-founder of Jasa KATOM, who until January 2000 was working at 50% of his time and is now providing 100% of his time to Heifer-Indonesia. Additionally, there are two Indonesian field staff—a Program Assistant (Abdul Syam Mahyudin) who has a background in anthropology and NGO work and a Technical Veterinary Assistant (Silfi Ganda Kesuma) who is a trained veterinarian. The program is also supported by a part-time Financial and Administrative Assistant<sup>6</sup>—Febrianti—who has been trained to take on bookkeeping responsibilities.

The Heifer-Indonesia program, which currently covers 8 provinces in Sumatra<sup>7</sup>, uses a different strategy than most of HPI's other programs worldwide. A fundamental part of this strategy is to work with communities through NGOs rather than working directly with the communities themselves. As a result of this strategic orientation, Heifer-Indonesia places a considerable emphasis on the quality of the relationships it develops

---

<sup>5</sup> This sub-contractual arrangement with a local organization is the first of its kind for HPI.

<sup>6</sup> Heifer-Indonesia's part-time secretary was promoted to this position on August 1st, 2000.

<sup>7</sup> At the outset of this grant, Heifer-Indonesia inherited two projects previously funded by HPI—one in Sumatra and one in Java—which were supported until 1999. While considered part of the program, both projects fell outside of Heifer-Indonesia's current strategy. Under this current strategy, there is no significant ongoing relationship with the NGO based in Java and the NGO based in Sumatra has been invited to participate in the Learning Community and the impact studies.

with local NGOs and on building their capacity to become self-sustaining organizations. To this end, Heifer-Indonesia has facilitated the creation of a loose affiliation of local NGOs compatible with Heifer-Indonesia's vision and interests, called the Learning Community (LC). The LC provides a forum for the sharing of ideas, networking and building institutional capacity. Heifer-Indonesia also provides training and support services, which contribute to capacity-building, to NGOs that are not members of the LC. Capacity-building efforts have recently culminated in Heifer-Indonesia funding the first new projects over the three-year grant period. The project holders of these four livestock projects are two LC member NGOs.

## II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The core evaluation team consisted of Jane Yudelman, an external evaluator; Jennifer Shumaker, the former HPI Director of Evaluation and HPI representative overseeing the evaluation of the matching grant; and Rienzzie Kern, the newly appointed HPI Director of Planning and Evaluation. The core team was also joined by Tom Dierolf, (Co-Country Representative), and Abdul Syam Mahyudin (Program Assistant) and Silfi Ganda Kesuma (Technical Veterinary Assistant), both of whom provided translation support.

Prior and subsequent to the field work, discussions were held with Heifer-Indonesia staff concerning the impact that the grant has had on the program, major achievements, problem areas, financial status and future directions. During the field portion of this evaluation, a total of ten NGOs were interviewed. (See Attachment 1 for Evaluation Itinerary.) These 10 NGOs represented a mixture of LC member NGOs and NGOs participating in Heifer-Indonesia activities independent of LC status<sup>8</sup>. Included amongst the LC member NGOs were the two NGOs that have received project funding under this grant to work with two community organizations (CO) each. All four COs and their respective livestock activities (two cattle, one fish and one water buffalo) were visited. Additionally, the team visited two communities in which the Bradley Impact Studies were being conducted.

Discussions at both the NGO and community-level were guided by the discussion questions developed collectively by Curt Schaeffer, Rienzzie Kern and Jane Yudelman in the USA prior to the start of the country-level evaluations. However, given the fact that the Heifer-Indonesia's program is somewhat different from those of Bolivia and Zimbabwe, it was necessary to adapt the questions to fit the context. Interviewing of NGOs, which was led by the core team, therefore focused on the following areas: Heifer-Indonesia's strategy and role, the LC, the Cornerstones Model, gender and future directions. For the final interview the two Heifer-Indonesia field staff led the discussions with the core team providing support, when and as needed. This shift was proposed since one of the expectations voiced at the outset of the evaluation process was that the staff would learn about evaluation. This opportunity provided the field staff with hands-on

---

<sup>8</sup> Of the ten NGOs, seven were Learning Community members and three were not members. Of the six Learning Community members, two were project holders and of the four non-members, one was involved in gathering information for the impact studies.



experience of conducting evaluation interviews and was supplemented later with discussions about evaluation in general.

Community-level meetings started with the community presenting its outputs from the Cornerstones Model planning process. Two groups were then formed, with Rienzzie Kern and Jennifer Shumaker leading the discussion with one and Jane Yudelman the discussion with the other. These smaller groups provided a greater opportunity for participation by community members. While one group focused on gender issues and the other on the relationship of the project holder NGO to the CO, further discussions on the Cornerstones Model, Passing on the Gift, training and other technical aspects were also included. Additional interviews were conducted at individual homes (about six per community) and visits made to the relevant animals. After each day's activities the entire team sat together to update the Co-Country Representative, who only attended the community-level meetings, and discuss what had been observed.

On returning to Bukittinggi, the core team met and developed draft country-level conclusions and recommendations based on the activities undertaken over the previous three years. These were presented to the Heifer-Indonesia staff in a workshop setting, who was, in turn, provided an opportunity to respond to the recommendations.

### **III. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

While the general thrust of this matching grant has been on the institutionalization of the Cornerstones Model, increasing gender awareness and focus in programming, developing systems for measuring impact, and the funding of projects, it is important to view these in light of the overall program strategy that frames the implementation of the matching grant. This is particularly important in the case of Heifer-Indonesia where strategy and focus depart significantly from HPI's other programs worldwide.

This section starts with a summary of the progress made towards meeting the objectives and then is followed by a more in depth discussion of the findings and conclusions, presented in the following order: strategic considerations, the institutionalization of the Cornerstones Model, gender training and related issues, measuring impact, project implementation, staffing and headquarters' support issues, and financial reporting and status of grant-related expenses. Recommendations are presented at the end of the report.

#### **A. Progress Towards Meeting the Country-specific Objectives of the Matching Grant: A Summary**

The Detailed Implementation Plan for the matching grant identified 5 general objectives for the Indonesia program. The table below reviews these objectives and indicates the extent to which they have been achieved. Before proceeding, it is important to note two facts. Firstly, the objectives are ambitious for a brand new country office and program. Secondly, the table presents a rough sketch of achievements and does not capture the more qualitative aspects of the Indonesia program, which are addressed in the remainder of the report.

Objectives	Status and Comments
1. Produce local manuals in Bahasa Indonesia for training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three manuals have been translated into Bahasa Indonesia and sold/distributed</li> </ul>
2. Conduct 4 impact studies in Indonesia and other Asian countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Of the 6 surveys needed to complete the impact study in Indonesia, 4 have been completed and it is anticipated that the 5<sup>th</sup> will be completed within the no-cost extension</li> </ul>
3. Strengthen eight NGO partner organizations for sustainable development programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heifer-Indonesia has provided training to the 22 NGOs in the LC and a number of non-member NGOs, which implies a degree of strengthening. However, the program lacks indicators for measuring “strengthening” or “capacity-building”, which makes it difficult to objectively assess the true progress in this area.</li> </ul>
4. 600 families benefit directly in HPI funded projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the two projects funded prior to the establishment of HP/IA, 250<sup>9</sup> families benefited. This includes families who received the originally placed and the pass-on animals.</li> <li>Under Heifer-Indonesia’s new strategy, funding of projects has only recently begun. Forty-eight families are participating in these new projects. These families have benefited from receiving training and an infusion of capital (in the form of animals), but given the newness of the projects it is not possible to assess the benefits that could accrue when the projects reach maturity.</li> <li>Combining the figures from both the old and the new projects, a total of 298 families may have benefited from the projects.</li> <li>To facilitate the measurement of impact in the future, Heifer-Indonesia recently began to introduce a simple system for measuring community level impact. It has also begun the process of developing a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system for the entire program. In the future, both of these systems should help Heifer-Indonesia to track those who “benefit”.</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> This figure is taken from the second annual report (1 October, 1998-30 September, 1999) of the matching grant and therefore does not include animals that might have been passed on during the final year of the grant.

Objectives	Status and Comments
5 Train 640 project participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exact figures are not available, but in the two projects funded prior to the establishment of HP/IA, it is estimated that hundreds of families have benefited from training.</li> <li>Under Heifer-Indonesia's new strategy, Heifer-Indonesia usually does not provide training directly to project participants. Heifer-Indonesia trains the project holders who in turn train the project participants. The exact number of project participants trained by the project holders is not available. However, since there currently 48 families participating, this number can be estimated about 96<sup>10</sup> if both the husband and wife attended training. If the future pass-on families were included in the training then the figure could be higher.</li> <li>Heifer-Indonesia has begun the process of developing a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system for the entire program, which may capture this type of measurement in the future.</li> </ul>

## B. Heifer-Indonesia's Strategy and Strategic Considerations

### 1) The Strategy

Heifer-Indonesia has been given both space and encouragement to explore a different strategy and model for working with NGOs and, ultimately, communities. Given the newness of the approach adopted to both HPI as a whole and to the Heifer-Indonesia staff, the program has been shifting and evolving as the Heifer-Indonesia staff gain greater understanding of the NGO context and their development philosophy, and becomes more adept in their own training skills and use of tools and processes that it promotes. The staff clearly put a great deal of thought into every step and have produced thought-provoking documents that both inform and challenge certain aspects of the way HPI as an organization works. Having said that, it is important to realize that this is clearly a program in evolution with more strategic thought needing to be given to its capacity-building mission.

Heifer-Indonesia describes its program as having two components. These are Building Institutional Capacity (BiC) and Sustainable Mixed Agriculture-Livestock Livelihoods (SMALL). The BiC component largely consists of the activities undertaken to support the development of the LC (see #3 "Partnerships—The Learning Community") and the SMALL component encompasses the agriculture and livestock-related activities that Heifer-Indonesia undertakes independent of the LC, but which may include LC member participation. It is through this component that livestock projects can be funded.

<sup>10</sup> HPI has trained 600 families in composting with funding from a different source. HPI believes that this training would not have been possible without the support from the matching grant to build NGO relationships and staff capacities.

As described, there appears to be a degree of overlap between the activities undertaken in the BiC and the SMALL, making the distinction between the two components a little unclear to the outside observer. Discussions with NGOs also revealed that they do not understand the different roles that Heifer-Indonesia wants to take on in different contexts. Heifer-Indonesia staff also confirmed this observation—that the NGOs are not clear about the organization’s roles and functions. The situation is perhaps further complicated by the fact that Heifer-Indonesia itself wants to distance itself as a funding agency when working with the LC—here it describes itself as an “equal learning partner”, while coordinating and funding most of the LC activities—when in reality HPI does fund projects and Heifer-Indonesia has, in fact, funded projects developed by 3<sup>11</sup> LC members. NGOs, on the other hand, definitely view Heifer-Indonesia as a potential source of funds for livestock-related activities. Heifer-Indonesia needs to embrace its funding identity more fully and use it to support its capacity-building agenda.

## 2) Guiding Principles

Heifer-Indonesia’s approach and strategy is framed by a number of key principles, which have direct bearing on how the program is implemented. The first of these is “praxis”—which Heifer-Indonesia translates as learning how to do something through practical, hands-on experience before teaching it to others. (By way of example, Heifer-Indonesia, before talking to NGOs about applying the Cornerstones Model for strategic planning at the organizational level, used the Cornerstones Model to develop its own strategic plan.) Applying this principle has afforded Heifer-Indonesia staff to become very familiar with the practicalities of a particular approach or tool, thus building its skills and credibility in certain areas both with its partner NGOs and within the HPI world. Its application, however, has slowed the pace of the program’s development to speed at which Heifer-Indonesia builds its own skills in key areas. This raises the question of whether or not it is the most appropriate approach for a brand new office that is starting more or less from ground zero and has been committed to certain objectives under the matching grant.

The second key principle is that of participation. Heifer-Indonesia is trying to promote a truly participatory approach in its work with NGOs. The manner in which the participatory approach is translated has direct bearing on Heifer-Indonesia central theme, that of building capacity. In its work with NGOs, Heifer-Indonesia is reticent to suggest possible support that it could provide to the NGOs for fear that this will subvert the participatory process. Rather, it chooses to “advertise” its services broadly and wait for NGOs to request assistance, follow-on support, or additional training. For the most part, the NGOs have not taken advantage of the follow-on assistance and services that Heifer-Indonesia can provide. To overcome this, Heifer-Indonesia needs to be more proactive with the NGOs, especially while it is building the program. This means spending more time with the NGOs, learning what follow-on support they might need and together developing a plan of action for providing or facilitating the provision of certain services. This is an important part of the capacity-building process—helping NGOs to identify their individual needs and plan ways to address them—and as NGOs become more aware

---

<sup>11</sup> Two LC NGOs received funding for projects developed under the current Heifer-Indonesia strategy and one LC NGO received follow-on funding for initiatives developed prior to the establishment of Heifer-Indonesia.

of their own capacity-building needs and the services that Heifer-Indonesia can offer, they themselves will become more proactive and begin to approach Heifer-Indonesia for assistance.

The third principle is that “the unit of development is the organization and not the project.” Heifer-Indonesia has translated this to mean that NGOs (especially those in the LC) should enter into a relationship with Heifer-Indonesia not motivated by funding, but rather by the opportunity to develop their capacities and skills. When NGOs did mention their interest in receiving funds, Heifer-Indonesia staff classified them as being “too project-focused”. Firstly, it is unrealistic to expect these smaller, less organizationally mature and less solvent NGOs—the very focus of Heifer-Indonesia’s capacity-building endeavors—not look towards funding opportunities, both to support their work in communities and to cover some operational costs. Without some funding base, organizations usually do not survive. Secondly, the way this principle is translated does not recognize the interaction between project funding and building the capacity of an NGO. NGOs need project activities around which to build their capacities, skills and credibility. Without these opportunities training becomes training for the sake of training. It is through a combination of training and funding more training that capacity-building of small NGOs is most effective. To fit a capacity-building agenda, funds could be contingent on receiving basic training and might be provided incrementally to participating NGOs based on the level of capacity. Additionally, the funded activities could provide Heifer-Indonesia with an opportunity to assess a wide range of NGO capacity-building needs and develop a strategy to address these.

### 3) Partnerships—The Learning Community (LC)

Heifer-Indonesia’s main approach to building partnerships is through the LC, which consists of 22 local NGOs plus Heifer-Indonesia. The LC was formed by Heifer-Indonesia during the early stages of its program development and was seen as a low cost, low risk way to begin to develop partnerships. Most of the members are small NGOs (of varying degrees of capacity and skills) with visions and interests compatible with those of Heifer-Indonesia. The LC provides a forum for NGOs to share, network, learn and strengthen their capacity. To date, there have been two Annual Learning Community Consultations (ALCC), with the next scheduled for November 2000, and four regional LC meetings. LC members have also been able to come together to discuss LC-related issues after attending training events supported by Heifer-Indonesia. All LC member organizations have been trained in the Cornerstones Model and most have attended training on gender. Additionally, with the guidance of Heifer-Indonesia, the LC has been using the Cornerstones Model to identify its own vision and shape its strategic plan and future directions. LC working groups, consisting of LC members and one Heifer-Indonesia staff, have been formed to develop a module for implementing the Cornerstones Model with COs, to develop a module on gender, and to draft operational principles (including a formalizing the organizational structure, and defining rules, regulations and fees for membership) for the LC.

Heifer-Indonesia fulfills a number of roles in the LC. It funds the costs associated with running the LC, which include administration, transportation to and from meetings, and

any LC activities. It oversees the activities—such as the working groups described above—of the LC. It promotes capacity-building largely through training to LC members and it acts as an equal learning partner in the LC.

From this evaluation it is clear that the LC is greatly appreciated in the NGO community—both by those NGOs that are members and by those that are not members—although the purpose of the LC as articulated by Heifer-Indonesia was not fully understood. When asked to explain the purpose of the LC, very few NGOs mentioned capacity-building, several mentioned learning from each other, most mentioned networking and almost all (members and non-members NGOs) mentioned LC membership as way of enhancing access to Heifer-Indonesia project funding and/or training despite the fact that this is not Heifer-Indonesia's stated policy. All of the non-member NGOs interviewed wanted to become members and in general there was a call for clearer guidelines on membership qualification and membership termination. All but one NGO indicated that they would be willing to pay a membership fee in the future and believed with proper guidance, NGO members and funds, the LC could evolve into a network independent of Heifer-Indonesia support in the future.

The concept of a learning community is good one and even though there is some confusion about its real purpose, NGOs do value it and the work that Heifer-Indonesia has put into it. Heifer-Indonesia should build on this and develop a strategy for enhancing its learning dimension, whether or not it decides to intertwine funding more closely to the capacity-building efforts. One way to do this would be to promote thematic learning groups based on interest and needs amongst the members. For example, those members interested in delving deeper into the practicalities of applying the Cornerstones Model might meet independently from the whole LC for this purpose and report back to the LC during the annual meeting. Similarly, members interested in learning more about a range of topics such as fundraising, environment, livestock management, and project management might form other thematic learning groups, inviting external resource people according to the purpose of the group. Such an approach would address the varying interests of the membership, increase the learning opportunities and build capacities of members potentially to the point where they can act as resources to other member and non-member NGOs in specified areas.

#### 4) Other Program Services and Activities

In addition to working with the LC for the LC, Heifer-Indonesia is poised to provide training, technical support and project funding to individual LC members and to NGOs that fall outside of the LC. To date, Heifer-Indonesia has provided training in the Cornerstones Model, gender awareness and gender analysis, training of trainers (TOT) in Popular Education, animal husbandry, para-veterinary services, and composting to LC and non-LC members.

The Cornerstones Model and gender training are discussed in detail in Sections C and D respectively. All of the remaining topics mentioned above have proven to be useful to the NGOs and COs. Of these, the training in Popular Education appears to have had the greatest impact on the way Heifer-Indonesia implements its program. Heifer-Indonesia

staff was all trained in Popular Education techniques by Susan Stewart, who developed and completed the manual entitled “Learning Together: The Agricultural Worker’s Participatory Sourcebook”, the development of which was partially funded under HPI’s previous matching grant. Heifer-Indonesia has since adopted the Popular Education approach and techniques in all of the training that it offers, and in its facilitation of LC meetings. Moreover, it has also replicated the Popular Education training for NGO staff and NGOs are now applying these skills to their work with communities. NGOs consistently mentioned this TOT training as having a significant influence in their work.

Heifer-Indonesia is also poised to offer more individualized support to NGO community in the areas in which it is working. This service, as already mentioned, is available to NGOs who request it. To date, one non-member LC NGO has requested support from Heifer-Indonesia to assist it in applying the Cornerstones Model to the development of its strategic plan. Other NGOs, while mentioning that they have faced difficulties in the use of the Cornerstones Model and could benefit from additional support, have not requested this service from Heifer-Indonesia.

Heifer-Indonesia has also translated three manuals into Bahasa Indonesia—“The Cornerstones Model: Value-based Planning and Management”, “Livestock for a Small Earth: The Role of Animals in a Just and Sustainable World”, both published by HPI, and “Ethnoveterinary Medicine in Asia” published by IIRR in the Philippines. These are sold/distributed to the NGO community. (Two other manuals are in the process of being prepared for distribution.) Heifer-Indonesia has also produced and distributed a newsletter for the NGO.

Additionally, Heifer-Indonesia provides funds for agriculture and livestock-related projects. Two new projects involving 4 COs have been funded to date and two old projects (inherited from the pre-Heifer-Indonesia days) were supported until their completion in 1999.

Heifer-Indonesia has conducted a number of useful and well-appreciated training workshops during this grant. It needs to build on these already initiated workshops and develop and implement a more comprehensive training strategy that identifies the sequencing of training, articulates a system for monitoring the impact of training, provides post-training follow-on support and links with Heifer-Indonesia’s funding capacity. This training strategy should be supported through the timely development of appropriate training modules (some of which are planned for the coming months) and through adapting already existing modules from HPI other programs. Additionally, to build on the formal training received (and, as already discussed, to enhance the capacity-building agenda of Heifer-Indonesia), Heifer-Indonesia needs to be more proactive in assisting NGOs to take advantages of the support services that it offers.

### **C. Cornerstones Model**

This matching grant has clearly assisted Heifer-Indonesia in institutionalizing the use of the Cornerstones Model both in its own work and in its work with NGOs and, by extension, with the communities. Since the Indonesia program is new and the grant

arrived at the time that structure was being given to the program, the introduction and use of the Cornerstones Model appears to have had a major influence on the program, its staff and within the HPI's Asia/South Pacific (A/SP) Region.

Heifer-Indonesia has fully embraced the Cornerstones Model as a planning tool and has used it to develop its own vision and strategic plan. It has conducted 5 Cornerstones Model training events resulting in 72 staff from 33 NGOs being trained in the use of the Cornerstones Model. Heifer-Indonesia also led the LC through the use of the Cornerstones Model to develop its vision and strategic plan and used the Cornerstones Model in the para-veterinary program planning workshop. It has translated the Cornerstones Model manual and training guidebook into Bahasa Indonesia and made these available to interested parties. It has also funded two projects involving 4 COs emerging from the use of the Cornerstones Model process in the communities and formed a working group of LC members to develop a module for using the Cornerstones Model with COs. Additionally, Heifer-Indonesia has successfully encouraged the use of the Cornerstones Model for developing the A/SP strategic plan and has provided technical assistance to HPI-Thailand in developing a Cornerstones Model-based strategic plan.

Visits to the NGOs revealed that the Cornerstones Model is well appreciated as a planning tool, and in particular one that emphasizes the importance of identifying values. Several NGOs have taken the model and begun to apply it to their own organizations in an attempt to define their situations and articulate their visions and values and one NGO, with technical support from Heifer-Indonesia, has gone as far as to begin to apply the Cornerstones Model to developing its strategic plans. Two NGOs have chosen not to apply the entire Cornerstones Model to their organization since, being affiliates of a national organization, they already have a predetermined mission and vision and are not in a position to change these. In most cases, though, the NGOs have taken the Cornerstones Model directly to the community, where it has been used most widely with COs for defining the situation and developing the vision and values and least widely for determining the strategic plan.

During the visits to Heifer-Indonesia-funded projects, CO members appeared conversant with the Cornerstones Model process. In two of the four COs visited with ongoing Heifer-Indonesia-funded livestock projects, the process helped the COs identify and begin to implement other activities in the community just using internal resources. In one case the CO decided to plant fallow communal land with chilies and beans, for both home consumption and commercial purposes. In the other case, the CO spearheaded the process for repairing the community's mosque using funds collected from community members.

While there was a great deal of appreciation for the model, NGOs indicated that they were having problems moving from the vision to the planning stage while implementing the model. This was true both when the model was used within the NGO and within the CO. This is an area in which Heifer-Indonesia should consider providing additional support to the NGOs both in the form of follow-up, hands-on assistance and in future training related to the Cornerstones Model.



The NGOs also indicated that some of the terminology and concepts were difficult to translate for appropriate understanding at the community-level and that the application of the Cornerstones Model at the community-level was very time consuming. In a number of cases it took between 5-9 meetings for the COs to complete the Cornerstones Model process. Heifer-Indonesia, therefore, could enhance the application of the Cornerstones Model by simplifying and localizing the terminology and concepts, as well as suggesting to NGOs simple timesaving strategies for applying the Cornerstones Model. Both of these improvements could partially be addressed in the module being co-developed by NGO and Heifer-International staff for use of the Cornerstones Model with COs.

Several NGOs also expressed strong desires for opportunities to share with and learn from other NGOs using the Cornerstones Model. In particular, the NGOs were interested in learning how others have adapted the model and overcome problems that have arisen during its use. Some sharing has already been done around the use of the model, but at a time when NGOs were less experienced with its application. Heifer-Indonesia should consider facilitating further opportunities for this now that more NGOs are using the Cornerstones Model and they are further along in their understanding and application of the model.

Discussions with the NGOs and with the Heifer-Indonesia staff also revealed that the application of the Cornerstones Model process could benefit from encouraging greater flexibility on a number of levels. Some NGOs are already trained in and are using other planning tools such as SWOT, PRA and Appreciative Inquiry. NGOs need to be encouraged to bring these into the Cornerstones Model process where appropriate both to build on their existing skills and to enhance the Cornerstones Model tool kit for new users. This may also ultimately enhance the utility of the Cornerstones Model when these NGOs approach other donors who are more familiar with other planning tools.

In broader terms, the use of the Cornerstones Model as an open-ended planning process is raising questions about how HPI as an organization effectively bridges funding livestock projects with other community development needs that might emerge through the use of the Cornerstones Model. In Heifer-Indonesia this dilemma may take on a slightly different twist. Heifer-Indonesia wants to promote bottom-up community planning that is not shaped by the fact that HPI funds livestock projects, while promoting a capacity-building agenda. Heifer-Indonesia staff explained that they will try to link NGOs and COs with other donors for funding of non-livestock projects emerging from the Cornerstones Model planning process, but as of now it has not developed the networks needed for doing this. In the instances where livestock-related activities are correctly identified as one of the top priorities in the COs' strategic plans, Heifer-Indonesia will consider funding the activities. It, however, needs to be made clear to all concerned that the livestock activities do not need to be the top priority, but rather that they need to have been identified as a priority and feature somewhere in the strategic plans. This clarification should help allay the fears that COs will identify livestock as the top priorities in order to receive funds (and in so doing sabotage the open-ended approach to the use of the Cornerstones Model), while still providing possible opportunities for COs to address real needs. From a capacity-building perspective, the planning and

implementation of a livestock project can develop both skills and confidence of the CO to take on other activities. It can also provide fertile ground for identifying the needs and building the capacity of COs and the NGOs, as well as help to build their CO and NGO credibility in the community and with other development organizations.

#### **D. Gender**

The matching grant has acted as the impetus for Heifer-Indonesia to initiate its gender-related training and focus. As with the Cornerstones Model, Heifer-Indonesia has applied gender principles and analysis to its own internal workings. The staff with 3 women and two men is gender balanced and there is no obvious gender bias to the division of labor.

To promote gender sensitivity and gender as a programmatic concern, Heifer-Indonesia has conducted 3 gender workshops, training a total of 21 NGOs (17 female staff and 23 male staff) in gender awareness and gender analysis tools. It has also encouraged NGOs to bring more gender balance, both at the NGO and the CO level, to the participants selected for training events. For funded projects, Heifer-Indonesia ensures that both the husband and wife sign the contract for the animal.

In discussions, NGOs indicated that the gender training for their staff has had the greatest impact on the personal lives of the staff. While some of the NGOs have gone ahead and provided gender training to the CO members, most feel that they need more skills (especially in gender analysis) before they can train the community. For those NGOs that have replicated the training at the community-level, it appears that the training is being conducted without much thought given to how gender awareness and the gender analysis skills that are developed can be applied in a meaningful way. A few NGOs have decided that gender principles are best tackled by integrating them into ongoing activities, but they are still grappling with how best to accomplish this. From the four projects visited there is little evidence that the gender principles have filtered down to community members. This observation is supported by the fact that most NGOs feel that they themselves have not had much of an impact on this to date.

Heifer-Indonesia has clearly taken an important first step in raising awareness through training about gender principles. In order to take the next steps, gender principles must be seen as an integral part of the planning and implementation process. To this end, Heifer-Indonesia needs to integrate gender principles into the Cornerstones Model—this is something that is already under consideration—and to ensure that these are enacted in the actual implementation of projects. Such an approach would make gender more of a strategic consideration, rather than simply a training topic.

#### **E. Impact**

##### **1) The Impact Study**

Four of the six surveys required for the impact study have been completed. A team of consultants hired to conduct the studies was trained by Dr. Felder at the outset of the exercise. The Heifer-Indonesia staff reported that the quality of the team's work became progressively more shoddy over the three surveys—introducing a number of data collection mishaps that, according to Dr. Felder of Bradley University, raise questions

about the validity of the data. For the fourth survey, a new team (an NGO that has participated in some Heifer-Indonesia activities) was contracted. Its staff was trained by Heifer-Indonesia and it has recently successfully completed administering the questionnaires.

Impact study participants were interviewed during this evaluation. All indicated that they found the process interesting, if somewhat long. (The survey now seems to take two hours to complete per family rather than the originally planned one-hour. Interviewers explained that the time frame had expanded because they needed to spend a fair amount of time explaining the questions.) During the survey process, the participants expressed that they were most interested by the questions and subsequent analysis concerning their household expenditures versus household income. All seemed eager to continue in the process.

Heifer-Indonesia, on the other hand, has been somewhat frustrated with the overall process, largely due to lack of communication from Bradley University—attempts to communicate with Dr. Felder have gone unanswered or have required intervention from the former Director of Evaluation. Further compounding the lack of enthusiasm for the study is the fact that the communities being surveyed originally received livestock and training from HPI-funded NGOs in the 1980s, prior to Heifer-Indonesia having an in-country presence and the development of the Cornerstones Model. The Indonesia study results, while perhaps being of use to HPI headquarters, are therefore viewed as being of questionable relevance to Heifer-Indonesia. As a result of these cumulative factors, Heifer-Indonesia has not made the management of the impact studies nor the possible content of them a priority.

## 2) Project Impact

Heifer-Indonesia has only recently funded projects so little thought has yet been given to incorporating the measurement of impact into the project cycle. Earlier in the grant period, the former Director of Evaluation had formulated a three-tiered system of varying degrees of complexity for measuring impact. The simplest and most basic system for measuring impact was called “the Volkswagen<sup>12</sup>” (also sometimes referred to as the “bicycle”). Heifer-Indonesia recently shared this tool with its two project holders, both of whom have adapted the tool and begun to collect baseline data. This tool may then become the basis of a system at Heifer-Indonesia for measuring project impact.

## **F. Projects**

### 1) Overview

Heifer-Indonesia has funded two new projects<sup>13</sup>—that include one CO with a fish project, one CO with a water buffalo project and two COs with cattle projects—through two NGO project holders and, up until 1999, continued to support two projects from the pre-Heifer-Indonesia days. Collectively the new projects involve 48 recipient families and the old projects 250 families (as of 1999), which makes a total of roughly 298 families,

---

<sup>12</sup> This measures changes in productive resources, education, housing and nutrition, as measured by food consumption.

<sup>13</sup> Three, if one counts the agriculture and demonstration project run by Heifer-Indonesia.

benefiting directly from HPI-funded projects. The Detailed Implementation Plan, however, called for 600 families to benefit directly from HPI-funded projects. To promote this objective, HPI itself committed enough match funds to support and average of 6-8 projects over three years, the intent being that Heifer-Indonesia would fund roughly 6 new projects (with funding commencing in the first year), as well as continue to support the two old projects until they reached completion. Clearly, with only four new projects that were funded about four to five months prior to the expected end of the matching grant, by HPI's own standards and expectations, Heifer-Indonesia has progressed very slowly in funding projects.

Given the fact that Heifer-Indonesia has been promoting a new strategy over the last three years, this evaluation focused only on the new projects that emerged from this new strategy and the discussion that follows refers only to the new projects and their project holders. The two new project holders represent two of the stronger NGOs in the LC and they have been working with the COs for a number of years. Both projects, which work with two COs each, are at the early stages of implementation. In two COs a group management approach is employed for taking care of the animals. Here, the animals are owned and managed by the COs. In both of these cases, schedules have been posted charting the individual responsibilities and these appeared to be clearly understood and smoothly implemented. In the remaining two COs, the animals are owned by the COs, but taken care of by individuals.

In all cases projects the COs and the NGOs are very enthusiastic about the use of the Cornerstones Model and the projects themselves. The COs articulated that the Cornerstones Model process helped to make their group more cohesive or unified. In two cases, it also allowed them to identify additional activities to undertake with their own resources. Again, in all cases, the animals appeared to be well taken care of as evidenced by the clean surroundings and presence of appropriate structures such as sheds and grazing pastures and sources of food.

Discussions with the members of the COs revealed all were aware of the pass-on concept, but most (especially in the group-managed projects) were not clear about the strategy to be used for the pass-on. This raises questions about the NGOs abilities to adequately advise the COs on this matter and about the leadership of and communication within the COs.

Additionally, it appears that the selection criteria for the recipient families tended to focus on the families' access to existing resources such as land and shelter for the animals, which may preclude the more needy members. In fact, in only one of the four COs was need identified as a selection criterion. It is therefore clear that the Heifer-Indonesia needs to provide more guidance concerning the application of this criterion (which is one of HPI's cornerstones) to the NGOs and by extension the COs. Worth considering too is the fact that Heifer-Indonesia guides the NGOs to work with COs that have been in existence for three or more years, and depending on the origin and make up of the CO, this in itself may preclude the needier members of the communities.

While the projects, for the most part, appear to be relatively well planned, there do appear to be some gaps that indicate the need for more attention to the technical details in future projects. For example, in two cases, the members of the COs indicated that for breeding purposes, they would have benefited by, in one case including bulls and in the other including more bulls, in the pool of purchased animals. Also, in the fish project, the selection of fish species appeared not to be appropriate for the season in which it was to be introduced, given the silt deposition into the river. Moreover, while the NGOs and communities have been provided some basic training in animal husbandry, there is high demand for more technical training at the community-level.

What emerged clearly from these visits is the fact that Heifer-Indonesia needs to build into its work some way of ensuring that NGOs and COs better understand certain important HPI cornerstones—in particular, improved animal management, (technical) training, genuine need, and nutrition and income benefits—all of which appear to be weakly represented in the projects.

## 2) Monitoring Projects

In three of the four projects animal health problems, unbeknownst to the project holders and to Heifer-Indonesia, were identified. While these problems were small and are surmountable, this situation did indicate the need for closer project monitoring. Heifer-Indonesia, therefore, needs to develop a simple monitoring system for projects and train the NGOs in the use of this.

## 3) Selecting Project Holders

Heifer-Indonesia has defined its criteria for selecting NGOs as possible project holders. These criteria include: a) similar or complementary development priorities; b) no overly sensitive affiliations; c) history of credibility and effectiveness; d) experience/capacity to expand into project component; and e) experience/capacity for needed accountability. These criteria clearly favor the selection of the stronger NGOs as project holders, which in itself may be an acceptable programmatic choice. However, if Heifer-Indonesia is promoting capacity-building as a major thrust of its programming either these criteria need to be relaxed to allow weaker NGOs an opportunity to learn from implementing a project or the weaker NGOs interested in applying for projects need to be provided with more assistance so that they may eventually qualify.

This aside, while these criteria have been circulated to the NGOs, they are unclear about these criteria, as well as the overall process for selecting project holders and funding projects. Amongst other things, contrary to Heifer-Indonesia's strategy and criteria, there is the strong belief that membership in the LC increases likelihood of funding and that funding is contingent on the application of the Cornerstones Model process.

Heifer-Indonesia's process for screening and ultimately funding projects involves screening, both the NGO and the CO with which it wishes to work. When working smoothly, by Heifer-Indonesia's own estimates, it should take an NGO roughly six months (assuming that there are no problems) to move from screening to funding. The screening process appears to be overly risk-averse given the capacity-building agenda,

and cumbersome and time consuming, especially considering the size of Heifer-Indonesia staff and their responsibilities. Heifer-Indonesia needs to consider ways to shorten this process (which for the current project holders took about a year<sup>14</sup>) to reduce NGO frustration and maintain the momentum in the communities.

### **G. Staffing and Support from Headquarters**

Heifer-Indonesia, as previously explained, has an unusual staffing arrangement—where the leadership is contracted through a local consulting firm, Jasa KATOM. The full-time local staff is however considered employees of Heifer-Indonesia and the secretary divides her time between Heifer-Indonesia and Jasa KATOM. Heifer-Indonesia has invested a considerable amount of time to develop the skills and capacities of the staff and has developed a strong team to interact with the NGOs. However, given the scope of the program and the distances between the targeted provinces, it is not possible for Heifer-Indonesia to maintain the type of contact that is needed to build the capacity of the NGOs. Heifer-Indonesia needs to expand the number of local staff by at least two—one additional Program Assistant and one additional Technical Assistant. To supplement this addition, Heifer-Indonesia also needs to identify and draw upon external expertise. This expertise could be drawn from within the LC<sup>15</sup>, Indonesia and A/SP (including from HPI A/SP offices). Also, given the relative youth of the field staff in terms of understanding the HPI organization as a whole, they and ultimately the program could benefit from greater exposure to other approaches and tools and materials used in the HPI world.

Heifer-Indonesia has received some support from HPI headquarters, but not as much as it has wanted and requested. Both Heifer-Indonesia and HPI headquarters have expressed a certain degree of frustration over this matter, highlighting the fact that expectations about types of support and channels of communications need to be discussed and clarified. The headquarters-Heifer-Indonesia support and communication problem appears to have been further complicated by a mismatch with management styles and management needs. The A/SP Area Director is trying to promote team management within the A/SP Region, which probably works well with older, more established and experienced programs. However, for a new program such as Heifer-Indonesia that has been requesting guidance and assurance, a more direct management style—including close supervision through frequent visits to the program—would be more appropriate.

### **H. Finances and Administration**

Heifer-Indonesia has had to overcome a number of hurdles regarding the financial aspects of the grants. Most of these grew directly out of the fact that Heifer-Indonesia, as a new country program with limited experience in dealing with USAID funding, was not offered the help necessary to get the whole financial system up and running smoothly. Others grew directly out of complications associated with sub-contracting with an already existing organization and the incredible currency fluctuations in Indonesia over the past

---

<sup>14</sup> This partly can be ascribed to the fact that the project holders were courted at a time when Heifer-Indonesia's training courses and operating systems had not been fully developed or applied.

<sup>15</sup> For example, Bina Swadya was a project holder in HPI's pre-matching grant period and through this has garnered considerable experience, which may be useful to the program, concerning the technical aspects of livestock projects.

three years. However, these too may have been avoided with the proper training and support in establishing a smoothly running financial system.

The two most notable financial problems reported in the implementation of the Heifer-Indonesia grant are as follows:

- In the early stages of the program Heifer-Indonesia's financial reporting to headquarters did not make the necessary distinctions between expenses charged against USAID's and HPI's portions of the budget. Based on feedback from headquarters, Heifer-Indonesia developed a computerized system tracking each line item and attributing expenses to USAID, HPI Match and Other Sources. It also put considerable time and effort into developing a bookkeeping system that clearly delineated Jasa KATOM's and HPI's records. The Program Assistant for A/SP has assisted Heifer-Indonesia in sorting through a number of these problems.
- Since HPI pays Jasa KATOM in dollars, but the program operates in Rupiah, Jasa KATOM-Heifer-Indonesia works in two currencies, tracking the expenses in Rupiah and reporting back in dollars. This in itself is not unusual or complicated, except for the fact that the exchange rate has been extremely volatile over the three years with considerable peaks and troughs<sup>16</sup> over short amounts of time.

Heifer-Indonesia has not focused on fundraising over the past three years. This means that, apart from \$12,525 it raised from other sources, the program is supported by this grant—consisting of USAID funds and a HPI match and by HPI unrestricted funds. This grant supports 100% of the salaries for both the Program Assistant and the Technical Veterinary Assistant, both of whom are vital to Heifer-Indonesia's delivery of services to NGOs and COs. It also covers 20% of the full time salary for the Country Representative with the remaining portion for the 1.5 time position being supported by HPI's match. Heifer-Indonesia has also contracted the services of technical consultants for translation and for conducting gender workshops. Beyond this, Heifer-Indonesia has not utilized the technical services<sup>17</sup> line item to support its program development.

Heifer-Indonesia's strategy, supported by HPI headquarters, was designed to develop the capacity of NGOs, while slowly and cautiously funding projects. This together with the fluctuations in the exchange rate—the higher the value of the US dollar, the more the Rupiah available for the program—has resulted in, as of 30<sup>th</sup> June, roughly 45% of the budget not being expended at the end of the three-year period. Of the funds that remain, 60% is intended for funding projects. Currently, the US dollar is valued at roughly three times the amount in Rupiah than it was when the grant was awarded and this will affect the amount of local funds available for the no-cost extension period. In order to program the remaining funds most effectively Heifer-Indonesia needs to develop and submit to

---

<sup>16</sup> At the start of the grant one dollar equaled 2,400 Rupiah and at the time of the evaluation it equaled 8,500 Rupiah. However during the grant, the dollar reached as high as 18,000 Rupiah.

<sup>17</sup> Instead of hiring the marketing specialist specified in the grant application, it distributed the fund allocated for this position to the three target countries to use to pay for technical services in marketing and other areas of need.

HPI headquarters within the next few weeks a budgeted plan for the use the remaining funds.

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

##### Strategy

1. If Heifer-Indonesia is going to make capacity-building its core program approach, it needs to develop a stronger, more integrated strategy that encompasses the core business of HPI as a whole—which is improving the quality of life of needy families while developing strong COs through livestock projects. One way to stimulate this integration would be to provide a series of grants for planning and learning that might culminate in the funding of livestock projects. This approach would allow capacity-building to be initiated around actual programming rather than in a vacuum.
2. The learning component of this program would be greatly enhanced by taking a less risk-averse approach. Such an approach would support both the weak and the strong NGOs, rather than focusing on the stronger NGOs. One possible way to promote such an approach would be to provide strong NGOs with support grants to assist or mentor the weaker NGOs.
3. Heifer-Indonesia strategy needs to include more proactive sharing of services and experiences in both the technical and capacity-building areas. Effectively, this means that Heifer-Indonesia needs to be creating the demand for its services rather than waiting for NGOs to request services. By way of example, when a weak NGO falls short of Heifer-Indonesia screening criteria and Heifer-Indonesia can provide services or can link the NGO with services to assist in building its capacity, Heifer-Indonesia should make the NGO aware of the specific assistance that it can offer and help the NGO develop a plan of action for addressing the weakness.
4. Heifer-Indonesia should extend outreach in providing such services by taking greater advantage of the rich resources that already exist and are being developed in the NGO community. An important part of this would be for Heifer-Indonesia staff to become more familiar with resources and skills that exist beyond the NGOs with which they already work.
5. As a means to build capacity of both the weaker and stronger NGOs, Heifer-Indonesia should consider classifying NGOs by capacity categories and tailor services to meet the specific needs of each category. This may mean providing more intense training and follow-up to NGOs in the low capacity category and a less hands-on approach with those NGOs in the high capacity category.

##### Training

6. To more effectively meet the needs of the NGOs and ensure sustainable projects, Heifer-Indonesia needs to develop a more comprehensive training strategy for all content areas. Such a strategy should include monitoring the effectiveness of training, providing follow-on assistance and designing additional training based on need.
7. In particular regard to projects, Heifer-Indonesia needs to develop a training package for project holders that is based on a training needs assessment and draws on existing expertise wherever possible, as well as adapting training modules from other HPI countries. As a starting point, Heifer-Indonesia could develop such training materials



by working with the existing fish, cattle and water buffalo projects. This would assist the NGOs implementing these projects, as well as prepare materials for future projects with these animals.

#### Projects

8. Heifer-Indonesia needs to review and refine the criteria and the application process, making them clearer and more transparent to the NGO community. Specifically with respect to the application process, Heifer-Indonesia should review this with the aim to shortening the process. HPI might want to consider seeking input from the LC while reviewing the criteria and application process since the LC is Heifer-Indonesia's focal point for learning and it is made up of NGOs with varying capacities. One suggestion for shortening the application process is for Heifer-Indonesia to provide clear screening criteria to the NGOs for COs and restrict Heifer-Indonesia's screening to the NGO level.
9. Planning of the livestock portion of the CO's activities must include greater emphasis on those HPI cornerstones that relate to passing on the gift, improved animal management, technical training, genuine need of the recipients and nutrition and income benefits. One possible way of doing this would be to provide an orientation to the NGOs and COs before they plan the details of the project. This could be done either by Heifer-Indonesia staff with livestock expertise or designated resources persons with such expertise.
10. Heifer-Indonesia needs to make clear to NGOs that funding of projects is not contingent on the use of the Cornerstones Model, and that projects will be considered for funding provided a participatory planning process has been used and the project is technically sound.
11. Heifer-Indonesia needs to develop a minimum standard and set of tools for monitoring projects and then provide training to the NGO staff in their use.

#### The Learning Community (LC)

12. In order to increase learning opportunities for LC members special interest groups (or learning clubs) should be formed around thematic areas of interest and these groups could meet more frequently and report back to the ALCC. For example, thematic learning clubs might emerge around topics such as monitoring and evaluation, processing and marketing of products, and fundraising. Heifer-Indonesia could provide guidance and input to the structure and functioning of these learning clubs.

#### Cornerstones Model

13. Heifer-Indonesia should allow NGOs more flexibility in the use of the Cornerstones Model to encourage the addition of innovative tools to be used in every step. This could improve the tool kit offered to new users, as well as adapt the Cornerstones Model to the local situations. It would also allow certain NGOs to draw upon tools in which they are already trained and well versed.
14. In the design of the upcoming module on the Cornerstones Model attention should be paid to simplifying and localizing the terminology and including examples of how others have applied the model in a less time consuming manner. Examples of how to shorten the application of the model may result in a more cohesive application of the

Cornerstones Model and less time expense for the participants of the Cornerstones Model exercise.

15. Heifer-Indonesia needs to provide more support to those implementing the Cornerstones Model in moving from the visioning to the planning phase. This can also be partially addressed through upcoming Cornerstones module being developed for use with COs.

#### Gender

16. Heifer-Indonesia should continue with its plans to integrate gender into the Cornerstones Model and in so doing draw from the experience of Heifer-Bolivia, which has integrated gender successfully into the Cornerstones Model. Further, it should use the projects as vehicles for deepening the appreciation of gender principles by helping NGOs to develop strategies for addressing gender concerns.

#### Impact

17. Building on the initial introduction of the “bicycle” system for measuring impact, Heifer-Indonesia needs to ensure that a set of core measures are developed and used across all projects. NGOs should be consulted in the development of this set of core measures and can add their own measures if they feel the need to do so.

#### Staffing

18. Given the ambitious scope of this program, Heifer-Indonesia needs to increase the number of field staff to adequately provide the services to the NGOs. At a minimum, two additional field staff (one from an NGO or social science and one from a technical background.) should be added. Ideally, this would allow Heifer-Indonesia to place two field staff in Southern Sumatra (e.g., Palembang) and two in Bukittinggi and in so doing increase the contact with and outreach to NGOs in the program. To further bolster the provision of specific services to the NGOs, Heifer-Indonesia should draw more actively on existing resources both from within and outside of the NGO community.
19. Since Heifer-Indonesia is a new program, field staff should be provided with more opportunities for exposure to other HPI country programs to share ideas about their program and learn from others.

#### Finance

20. Heifer-Indonesia needs to develop a plan for using the remaining funds during the no-cost extension, should it be granted. Some recommendations for the use of these funds are:
  - Hire a consultant to develop a comprehensive training strategy
  - Hire a consultant or bring in technical assistance from another HPI country office in Asia to assess the technical training needs of the community organizations currently with Heifer-Indonesia projects and produce training materials and modules to enhance the technical aspects of water buffalo, fish and cattle projects.
  - Use some of the remaining funds to establish planning, learning and support grants to promote the development of projects and mentoring between stronger

and weaker NGOs. (See Attachment 2: Some Thoughts on Planning, Learning and Support Grants)

- Actively follow-up with the NGOs that have shown interest in developing projects and provide them with the assistance needed to qualify for approval and funding before the end of the grant period.
- Provide funds for field staff to visit other country programs or clusters of programs
- Use funds to facilitate cross visits between NGOs and between COs.

## **ATTACHMENT 1: EVALUATION ITINERARY**

1 August	Arrival in Bukittinggi
2 August	Discussions about the program and the evaluation
3 August	Travel to Palembang
4 August	Meet with YPD and YP2M
5 August	Visit Bangsal water buffalo project
6 August	Visit Sri Kembang fish project, meet with Kemasada
7 August	Travel to Lampang
8 August	Meet with Yabima, visit Ongele cattle project
9 August	Meet with Bina Swadaya-Kota Gajah, visit two impact study communities
10 August	Visit Bali cattle project, meet with Bina Swadaya-Metro
11 August	Travel to Padang
12 August	Meet with LP2M, YBTI and PKBI in Padang, return to Bukittinggi
13 August	Development of conclusions and recommendations
14 August	Discussions about recommendations with Heifer-Indonesia staff
15 August	Final wrap-up and departure

## ATTACHMENT 2: SOME THOUGHTS ON PLANNING, LEARNING AND SUPPORT GRANTS

### Planning and Learning Grants

Planning grants are very small grants (say, \$50<sup>\*</sup>) awarded to NGOs for the sole purpose of working with a community organization to identify and plan a development activity in community. During the interviews, some NGOs pointed to the lack of resources needed to work in the community as a barrier to submitting proposals to Heifer-Indonesia. This type of grant would provide NGOs—especially those that are most strapped for funds—with the resources needed to go to the community and conduct planning adequately. In the Heifer-Indonesia program, these grants might be tied to the use of the Cornerstones Model—that they be awarded to NGOs interested in using the model with a community organization to establish the vision, develop a strategic plan etc. and plan a small scale activity. Alternatively, they could be more open ended and be available to NGOs as long as they will be using a participatory approach.

Requirements for accessing the planning grants should be minimal. For example, if they are tied to the use of the Cornerstones Model, then a requirement might be that the NGO has attended at least one training in the use of the model and be willing to participate in a learning club on the Cornerstones Model. Another requirement might that the NGO has to take the initiative to fill out a very simple form and submit it by a specified deadline. The idea is to make accessing these grants very easy, but not totally without effort on the behalf of the NGO.

NGOs receiving and using planning grants in a participatory manner to plan a small-scale livestock related activity with the community will be guaranteed a learning grant (also very small, perhaps in the range of \$500<sup>\*</sup>) on submission of the application, which should also be very simple. Keeping the application procedure simple is important to the “learning” agenda of these grants. The learning agenda is three-fold. 1) NGOs (especially the weaker ones) are provided the opportunity to plan with the community and implement an activity through the learning grant, thus developing their own skills and experience base. 2) Heifer-Indonesia is provided with an opportunity to identify problems that the NGOs have in planning and implementing activities and can assist the NGOs to build their capacity around these and other wider organizational areas either through hands-on support or through training events for clusters of NGOs. For example, if three NGOs had problems handling the funds due to poor financial management skills, Heifer-Indonesia might arrange for them to be trained in basic bookkeeping skills. 3) Heifer-Indonesia is provided with the opportunity to distinguish which NGOs are serious/committed (but perhaps lack skills) and which are not serious and are not worth expending much additional effort on. Additionally, this might provide an opportunity for Heifer-Indonesia to identify NGOs which it thinks could adequately handle a larger livestock project or an opportunity to identify the training that is needed before they become eligible for the larger grants. Additional learning clubs might also emerge from those NGOs implementing these grants.

---

<sup>\*</sup>These figures are used to exemplify the relative smallness of the grants, but would need to be adjusted to fit the Indonesian context.

Since all of these grants are small and their main purpose is to allow NGOs to develop experience and to promote the learning agenda, it would not be necessary to monitor each grant in the way that the existing grants are monitored. Rather, the key would be for Heifer-Indonesia to monitor the overall process.

#### The Support Grants

Support grants could be provided to strong NGOs to assist the weaker NGOs in areas of need. This might be tied into the above learning grant process or might apply to the larger grants. So, for example, if an NGO is implementing a livestock project, but seems to be facing difficulties with respect to the technical animal management training, a support grant could be provided to an NGO that is strong in animal management for the purpose of “supporting” the weaker NGO in this area. Similarly, as the program proceeds, Heifer-Indonesia could provide support grants to NGOs to act as mentors to a weaker NGO throughout the entire project. These grants, if applied creatively, could support a whole range of functions

### ATTACHMENT 3: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- 1) Final Evaluation of Heifer Project International's Integrated Farm Family Development Matching Grant IV, Prepared for USAID by Yudelman and Pfohl, August 1996.
- 2) "Building Capacity Through the Cornerstones Model", Matching Grant Application, Fiscal Year 1997
- 3) Detailed Implementation Plan, Matching Grant Program "Building Capacity Through the Cornerstones Model", Beginning Date: October 1, 1997
- 4) Mid Term Review of Heifer Project International's Building Capacity through the Cornerstones Model-Matching Grant V, Prepared for HPI by Jane Yudelman, July 1999
- 5) "The Cornerstones Model: Values-based Planning and Management", by Jerry Aaker and Jennifer Shumaker, HPI (1996)
- 6) Cornerstones Matching Grant—Second Annual Report (1 October, 1998-30 September, 1999)
- 7) Cornerstones Model Implementation Strategy—Working Paper, Heifer-Indonesia (May, 1999)
- 8) Country Program Sustainability Strategy—Working Document, Heifer-Indonesia (June, 1999)
- 9) Becoming a Learning Organization: Learning to Reflect, Advocate, and Inquire, Heifer-Indonesia (March, 2000)
- 10) Bolivia USAID Matching Grant Cornerstones Workshop Trip Report, April 28-May 3, 2000, by Dan Gudahl, HPI Africa Area Director
- 11) The Cornerstone Model Dialogue Draft Summary, by Jerry Aaker, Santa Cruz (May 28-June 2, 2000)
- 12) Putting the Cornerstones Model into "Praxis"—Presented at the "Cornerstones Model Dialogue", Heifer Indonesia, Santa Cruz (28 May-2 June, 2000)
- 13) Strategic Program Plan #6, Heifer-Indonesia (June, 2000)
- 14) Partnership Policy Paper—Results of a First Approximation, Heifer Indonesia (January 29-February, 1999)
- 15) Developing Monitoring and Evaluation and Impact Assessment Systems for HPI/Indonesia—Draft Working Paper, Heifer-Indonesia (July, 2000)
- 16) Heifer-Indonesia Quarterly Progress Reports from January 1997-June 1999
- 17) Project Summary Sheet—KJUB PUSPETASARI Klaten, Dairy Development Program, Heifer-Indonesia
- 18) Project Summary Sheet—Bina Swadaya, Intensification and Improvement of Livestock Production, Heifer-Indonesia
- 19) "Learning Together: The Agricultural Worker's Participatory Sourcebook", Susan Stewart, HPI (n.d.)